

10 A 3

T W O  
T R E A T I S E S,  
One of the  
Christian Priesthood,

The Other of the DIGNITY of  
The EPISCOPAL ORDER.

First Written, and afterwards Published to  
obviate the *Erroneous Opinions, Fallacious Rea-  
sonings, and Bold and False Assertions*, in a late  
Book, entituled,

*The Rights of the Christian Church.*

With a large PREFATORY DISCOURSE

In Answer to the said BOOK.

---

All written by GEORGE HICKES, D. D.

---

With an APPENDIX;

Whereto are added in this Edition *several New  
Tracts, viz.*

A particular TREATISE written by *Isaac Casaubon* of Geneva,  
entituled, *De Libertate Ecclesiastica*, of the Liberty (or free E-  
state) of the Church.

Mr. *Hughes's* PRELIMINARY DISSERTATIONS (to *St. Chrysostom de  
Sacerdotio*) wherein the Authority of the CHURCH, as it is distin-  
guish'd from that of the STATE, is explain'd and defended, and  
all the Objections of the *Erasmians* answer'd, especially those of a  
late Author, who has publish'd a Book entituled, *The Rights of  
the Christian Church, &c.*

---

THE THIRD EDITION ENLARGED.

---

In two VOLUMES.

---

LONDON: Printed by W. B. for RICHARD SARE at  
Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn. 1711.

---





*An ACCOUNT of this Third Edition of the FOLLOWING BOOK, and the ADDITIONS therein; wherein Dr. Hakewel's Dissertation with Dr. Heylin, touching the Pretended Sacrifice of the Eucharist is answered; with some OBSERVATIONS and STRICTURES upon the CHARGE, which the Bishop of Norwich deliver'd to the Clergy of the Diocese, at a Visitation in the Year 1709.*

I Think my self obliged to give some Account of the Additions in every part of this Book, by which in this Edition it is augmented into two Volumes. I shall begin with the first Treatise of the *Christian Priesthood*, in which something hath been added in almost every Page of the former Editions, but more especially from the 38<sup>th</sup> to the 65<sup>th</sup> Page, where I treated of the *Christian Sacrifice or Oblation* in the H. Eucharist; and what in them took up but 14 Leaves, in this Edition printed in the same Types takes up 52, from p. 42 to p. 146. Where, as I promised <sup>a</sup> elsewhere, and <sup>b</sup> another hath

---

<sup>a</sup> In the Epistle to the Reader, before the *Second Collection of Controversial Letters*, printed for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn. 1710.

<sup>b</sup> A *Seasonable and modest Apology*, in Behalf of Dr. George Hickes, and other Non-Jurors; in a Letter to Th. Wise, D. D.

promised for me, I have shew'd from the unanimous and universal Tradition of the ancient Catholick Church, that, the H. Eucharist like other material Oblations, was deemed a Sacrifice, in which the *Bread* and *Wine* were really and literally offer'd up to God the Father, and that the ancient Doctrine, and belief of its being a proper Sacrifice, is at least as plainly founded in the Scriptures of the New Testament, as several other Doctrines, which those, who are so unwilling to embrace *this*, believe upon the consentient, universal Tradition of the same Catholick Church. To pass over what Dr. *Wise* hath said in his *Visitation Sermon*, as not worthy of farther notice than hath been already taken of it; two other Persons of the contrary Opinion have written against it since the last Edition of my Book, to wit, Dr. *Hancock* <sup>a</sup> in two Tracts mentioned in the Margin, and Bishop *Trimnell* in his *Charge deliver'd to the Clergy of the Diocese of NORWICH*. But they have both received such a full, and solid Answer from an unknown very judicious, and learned Hand, in a Book entituled <sup>c</sup> *The propitiatory Oblation in the H. Eucharist, &c.* that I might have been excused, had I not added one Word to what I had written upon that Subject in the former Editions of *The Christian Priesthood*. However, I thought all learned Men, interested in this Controversy, would expect something more from me upon the Subject; and I hope I have now said enough to make it appear, that all the ancient Churches believed

<sup>c</sup> In a Letter to the Doctor, entituled, *A seasonable and modest Apology, in Behalf of Dr. George Hickes, and other Non-Furors*. London, printed for Sam. Keble. 1710.

<sup>d</sup> An Answer to some things contained in Dr. *Hickes's Christian Priesthood, &c.* and *Patres Vindicati, &c.*

• London, printed for John Morphew near Stationers Hall. 1710.



the *Bread, and Wine*, to be the proper Subject Matter of the Christian Oblation in the H. Eucharist, or the *sensible things*, which they really offered and believed ought to be really offered to God in that H. Service, for the Sacrificial Feast, and by Consequence that they thought it to be an *outward Sacrifice* properly so called. In these Editions I have also tacitly answered the most material Objections of those two Authors, against the Christian Sacrifice, as they themselves, or any other Persons versed in their Writings, may perceive, and I hope the latter, when he hath read them, will not think it so *new* or unaccountable, *that the Presbyters of a Reformed Church should lay claim to it*, as his Lordship expresseth himself. Surely they have a Right to claim that, which the Prelates of the whole Catholick Church claimed, and to which Bishops themselves were expressly ordained, viz. To offer up the *Bread and Cup* in that H. Sacrament, as I<sup>s</sup> have shew'd from the most ancient Form of Consecration; and that they ought to esteem that as an Honour, which I have shew'd was so often singled out, as the most honourable part of the Priest's Office, even of the Episcopal Office itself. Wherefore the Bishop objects to little purpose, that this Doctrine of *offering a proper Sacrifice in the Eucharist* hath been revived of late for advancing the Honour of the Clergy; but it is not any matter, how lately it hath been revived, or by whom, or for what end, so it be true, and Catholick, *quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper*, as I hope I have proved it to be. His Lordship also tells his Clergy, that it is advanced with *a little Foundation, and a little probability of Success*, as that, of *the Independency of the*

<sup>f</sup> Visitation Charge, p. 13.

<sup>g</sup> Christian Priesthood, p. 194.

*Church upon the State*: To which I answer, first, That if it hath but as good a Foundation, as the *Independency of the Church upon the State*, its Foundation is very sure in the Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, as he may see in *Is. Casaubon's Tract de Libertate Ecclesiastica*, which I have published in the *Appendix* for my own Justification, and I hope for his Lordship's Satisfaction. As for the Success of either Doctrine, that is in the Hands of God, but his Lordship must be little acquainted with the World, if he doth not know there are considerable Numbers among the most Learned, who believe both, and particularly that of the Eucharistical Sacrifice as he hath found by the *propitiatory Oblation*, and the procemial Dissertation of Mr. *Hughes* before *St. Chrysost. de Sacerdotio*, translated into *English* in the *Appendix*; and may also find by the living Testimonies of others I have<sup>n</sup> produced. And if his Lordship will do me the Honour to believe me, I can assure him there are very many more of the best Authority, and Reputation, both among the Clergy, and *Laitie* too, besides Mr. *Nelson*, who believe this Doctrine; and I beseech his Lordship to consider, if it is so *new*, or so *unaccountable* for the *Presbyters of a reformed Church* to assert it, as for *Bishops*, and *Presbyters* of the Church of *England*, to assert the Doctrine of *Resistance*, which is as plainly condemned by Her in all Cases, or for any Cause, as these, and many such like Words and Sentences, can express. When my Lord can bring me half as many, or half as plain Texts of Scripture against the *Eucharistical Oblation*, as I can bring against *Resistance*, or prove it not to have been the Doctrine of the ancient Catholick Church, from half as many, or half as plain Testimonies of Fa-

---

<sup>n</sup> In the Preface and Appendix.

thers, and Councils, as I have proved it was, then I will believe with Mr. *Hoadley*, that *Resistance of Sovereign Powers* is not only lawful, but laudable, and that it is our Duty to resist, and depose them, when they do not answer the Ends of Government, and a damnable Sin in that Case not to resist. I think it very strange for any Bishop, or Presbyter of the Church of *England*, to oppose a Doctrine which is so apparently founded in Scripture, and supported by *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*, and yet embrace another, which is neither warranted by Scripture, or Tradition, but expressly condemned by both, as well as by that Church of which they are Priests. And if it be an Argument against the Oblation of *the Bread, and Wine* in the Eucharist, that <sup>1</sup> Mr. *Mede*, and Dr. *Heylin* were the first Writers of the Reformed Churches, that published this Doctrine, as the Bishop from Dr. *Hakewell* observes; how much a better Argument is it against the Doctrine of *Resistance*, that those among us, whom I need not Name, were the first Writers of the Church of *England* owning her Communion, that contrary to her Doctrine, their own Subscriptions to it, the Testimony of her Martyrs, and the whole Torrent of her Writers since the Reformation, published that Doctrine, which if it be false must needs be damnable, whereas the Doctrine of the *Eucharistical Oblation*, as taught by me after Mr. *Mede* and others, if it be not true, is but a harmless Errour, for the Belief, and Practice of which, no Man shall endanger his Soul. But indeed it is no Argument at all against the the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, were it true, that *Mede*, and *Heylin*, were the first Publishers of it in our Church, unless my Lord will acknowledge

it to be an Argument against his own Order, that of all the Reformed Churches, the Church of *England* was the first, and almost the only one <sup>k</sup> which hath retained Episcopacy, and taught that it was to be continued in the Church. How therefore, how can it be an Argument against an old Catholick Doctrine, and Practice, that it is at any time *revived*, and publish'd where it happens to be forgot, neglected, or disused? though I grant his Lordship it is a very strong Argument against any Doctrine, and Practice, and particularly that of Resistance; (of which Catholick Antiquity was not only entirely silent, but full of Testimonies to the contrary;) and the Differences of the two Cases is so great, that I may presume to tell his Lordship, and I hope without Offence, that the Doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist *needs fear no Censure*; but that of *Resistance*, as it deserves Censure, so it hath just Reason to fear it, and will, I trust, sooner or later feel the Censures of the Church.

But his Lordship saith, that Dr. *Hakewell*, in his *Dissertation*, hath shewn that *neither the Scriptures, nor the Authority of the Fathers, do warrant any such Notion*. But I appeal to any unprejudic'd Person, who will compare what I have written upon this Subject, with what Dr. *Hakewell* hath said against it, whether he hath shewn, or could shew, that there is no Notion of a visible, true, and proper Sacrifice in the Scriptures and Fathers, as Sacrifice signifies an *Oblation of a sensible, or visible Gift to God*. The Dr. only pretends to prove that neither *Irenaeus*, nor *Eusebius*, cited by *Heylin*, are to be understood of a Sacrifice *properly* so called. But Dr. *Heylin* proves it also from other Au-

---

<sup>k</sup> Preface before the Form, and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.



thorities, as these of St. Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, of which Hakewell takes no Notice. As to Irenæus, Dr. Heylin cited only two Passages out of him, which are in Latin, in *lib. iv. cap. 34.* the first of them is thus a little abbreviated, *Non genus Oblationum reprobatur est, Oblationes enim & illic, Oblationes autem & hic: Sacrificia in populo, Sacrificia & in Ecclesia: Sed species immutata est tantum, quippe cum jam non a servis, sed a liberis OFFERATUR.* But this Passage Dr. Hakewell passes over, I need not stick to say because it was too hard for him, especially as attended with other Passages he could not solve; as, *Ecclesia oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum Sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, & acceptum ei est, non quod indigeat a nobis Sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus, per munus enim erga Regem, & bonos, & affectio ostenditur: Quod in omni simplicitate & innocentia Dominus volens nos offerre pradicavit dicens, cum igitur*<sup>1</sup> offers Munus tuum ad Altare, &c. There are ma-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hunc Evangelii locum de Eucharistiæ oblatione cum Irenæo interpretantur B. Clemens Rom. *lib. ii. Const. Apost. cap. 58, (57.)* Optatus Milev. *lib. vi. contra Parmen.* Cyrill. Hieros. *St. Catech. Mystagog. Fenard.* Disti enim, ut & alii Auctores memorant ritum Ecclesiæ, quo Diaconi hortabantur fideles ad S. Eucharistiam accessores, ne cum inimicitia, vel discordia ad Altare venirent, in hoc servatoris præcepto utique fundatum, & sane cum hoc contineatur eximio isto Sermone, quo novam legem, aut verè novam fidelibus suis observandam promulgavit, non tam Mosaicæ oblationes cum Altari ac templo brevi abolendas, sed Altare, ac sacrificium Ecclesiæ jam jam instituendum respexisse, ac tale supposuisse videtur, quale etiam in Christianorum Cœtibus fuisse, non solum Irenæus, & antiquior Ignatius sed & ipse Apostolus testatur, *Hebr. xii. 10. Habemus Altare ex quo edendi non habent potestatem, qui Tabernaculo deserviunt.* Et per consequens etiam quovis Sacrificium, non solum rationale laudis & præcium, sed & Materiale panis & vini, quod verbo *edendi* clare significat Apostolus. *Græbe in locum.*

ny more such literal Passages in that Chapter, besides what that Father had said in the Chapter preceding: as, *Sed & suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creatura est panis accepit, & gratias egit, dicens, hoc, &c. Et Calicem similiter, &c. Et Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, &c.* The other Passage which Heylin uses is this: *Offerimus ei non quasi indigenti sed gratias agentes donatione ejus, & Sanctificantes Creaturam.* This Passage the Doctor cited to shew only what kind of Sacrifice the Eucharistical was, to wit, a Sacrifice of Gratitude and Thanksgiving, whereof the *Materials, viz.* the Bread and Wine, were sanctified, or consecrated by the Priest. To this Dr. Hakewell saith nothing what became him, but in a most futile manner replies, *But is any Man so weak as from thence to infer a Sacrifice properly so called? The sanctifying, or consecrating the Bread to holy Uses, we all grant to be the proper Office of the Priest, or Presbyter, and the giving of Thanks common to him, and the People, but that either of these is a Sacrifice properly so called, that we deny, and desire to see proved.* But did not the Doctor know, that the Consecration of the Bread, and giving of Thanks, to which, Heylin observed, *Offerimus* relates, was of the Bread as of an Offering, as a *munus*, or Gift to God, and an Oblation of the New Testament. Besides the Passages just now cited out of Irenæus, these which follow in the same Chapter prove it most expressly: *Oportet & nos oblationem Deo facere—Hanc oblationem Ecclesia sola pura offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum Actione ex creatura ejus. So Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia*

*Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans, terrena, & celesti: Sic &c.* And what this *Invocation* was at the Oblation of the Creatures of Bread, and Wine, and how they were joyn'd together in the holy Action, though I have shew'd it abundantly in the Additions to the Christian Priesthood, yet I shall by and by have occasion to mention it again.

As to the other Authority out of the tenth Chapter of the first Book of *Eusebius de Demonstrat. Evang.* Dr. Heylin makes use of the five following Passages, whereof this is the first. *When therefore according to the Testimonies of the Prophets, this great, and pretious Price of Redemption was found both for Jews, and Greeks; when this piacle for the whole World, this Ἀντίψυχον for all Men, this pure Sacrifice for all Vice, and Sin was found, to wit, the Lamb of God, that most holy Sheep acceptable to God, that Lamb foretold by the Prophets, by whose Divine, and mystical Doctrine, all we of the Gentiles have found Remission of our former Sins; and those of the Jews, who trust in him, are freed from the Curse of Moses's Law, daily celebrating, as they ought, the Memory of his Body, and Blood, being counted worthy of a more excellent Sacrifice, and Ministry than any in ancient times.* The second Passage is this: *Then he adds (saith Hakewell) that Christ our Saviour offering such a wonderful, and excellent Sacrifice to his heavenly Father for the Salvation of us all; he also appointed us to offer daily Μνήμην, the Commemoration of the same to God: Ἀντί τ' Ψυχίας, for, and as a Sacrifice.* And anon after he adds, that whensoever

<sup>m</sup> i. e. This Sacrifice given for the Souls of all Men.

<sup>n</sup> Ἐκόντως τ' τῷ Σώματι αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι τ' ὑπόμνησιν ὁσμήμεναι ὁμιλεῖσθαι, καὶ τ', κρείττον' ἢ καὶ τὸ πάλαι, ψυχίας τὲ καὶ ἱερευσίας ἡγεωμένοι.

we celebraire τότε τὸ θύματ<sup>ο</sup> τῆ Μνήμην ἐπὶ τραπέ-  
ζης ἐκτελεῖν ἐξ<sup>ο</sup> Συμβόλων τῶ τε Σώματι<sup>ο</sup> αὐτοῦ, καὶ  
Σωτηρίας Αἰματι<sup>ο</sup>, &c. the Memory of that Sacri-  
fice on the Table, partaking of the Symbols of his  
Body, and Blood, &c. we should say with David,  
Thou preparest a Table for me in the Presence of mine  
Enemies; thou anointest my Head with Oyl, my Cup  
runneth over. Wherein, saith he, <sup>p</sup> the Prophet sig-  
nifies the mystical Unction, καὶ τὰ Σεμνά τῆ χειρὸς  
τραπέζης θύματα, and the Reverend Sacrifices of Christ's  
Table; where we are taught to offer unto the Lord by  
his own most eminent, and glorious High Priest, the  
unbloody, reasonable, and most acceptable Sacrifice all  
our Life long. This is the third Passage, which  
Dr. Heylin produces, where I cannot but observe,  
that Eusebius according to the Tradition of the other  
Fathers, as I have shewn from them, and from the  
most ancient Form of Consecration in the Christian  
Priesthood, asserts, that Christ appointed the Sacri-  
fices of his own Table, to wit, the Symbols of Bread,  
and Wine to be offered unto God. Then the Do-  
ctor proceeds, to the fourth Passage in these Words:  
this he entitleth afterwards <sup>r</sup> the Sacrifice of Praise,  
the divine, reverend, and most holy Sacrifice, the  
pure Sacrifice of the New Testament. Then he  
proceeds to the last in these Words: Finally he  
joyns both these together in the Conclusion of the Book,  
and therein doth at full describe the Nature of this  
Sacrifice, ἐκέν καὶ θυόμεν, καὶ θυμιώμεν: τότε μὲν  
μνήμην τοῦ μεγάλου θύματος<sup>ο</sup>, &c. Therefore we sacri-  
fice, and offer, as it were with Incense, the Memory

<sup>ο</sup> Συμβόλων, Symbols.

<sup>p</sup> P. 121, 122.

<sup>r</sup> P. 149.

<sup>s</sup> Θυσίαν Αἰνέσεως θυόμεν τὸ ἕνθεον, καὶ θυμιών, καὶ ἱεροπρατεῖς  
θύμα, καὶ καθαράν θυσίαν.



of that great Sacrifice, celebrating the same according to the Mysteries by him given to us, and giving Thanks to him for our Salvation with godly Hymns, and Prayers to the Lord God, as also offering to him our whole selves, both Soul, and Body, and to his High Priest, which is the WORD. Here I must observe that in this last Passage ἐν τῷ καὶ θυμῷ, καὶ σώματι, Eusebius alludes to Malach. i. ii. My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering. Which in the second Book he applies as a prophetic Prediction to the spiritual Sacrifice of the Eucharist, as in the Christian Priesthood I have shew'd the antient Fathers did, who always understood by the *Mincha purum*, the pure Offering, the material unbloody Oblation of Bread, and Wine, and by the Offering of Incense, the spiritual Offering of Thanksgiving, Prayers, and Prayers with chaste, and unpolluted Bodies, and Minds purged of malicious, and all other evil Affections, which attended the Oblation of the Elements. And *These*, saith he, we are taught to believe are more acceptable to God, than a Multitude of Sacrifices offered with Blood, and Smoak, and Nidor.

Now let us see what Dr. Hakewell saith to all this. Dr. Heylin, saith he, foreseeing what he had alledged did not reach home to his purpose, endeavours to make it up by the Addition of this last Clause, as if Eusebius made the Memory, or Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ to be in, and of itself a Sacrifice; and this he would collect from these Words of his ANTI THE ΘΥΣΙΑΣ, which he translates for, and as a Sacrifice, whereas both Bishop Bilson, and Dr. Reynolds, and others of our best learned Divines, translate it instead of a Sacrifice. Now that

which is instead of a Sacrifice, cannot be indeed, and of itself properly so called. And besides, how shall we be said to offer up our Commemoration for a Sacrifice, as the Doctor (Heylin) affirmeth, I cannot understand, since Commemoration is an Action, and being so, it cannot in Propriety of Speech be the thing sacrificed, which must of Necessity be a Substance, as it stands in Opposition to Accidents. So that if neither the Sanctification of the Creature, nor the Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ, nor the offering up of our selves, or Praise and Thanksgiving can amount to a Sacrifice properly so called, surely the Doctor hath not yet found it in the Fathers, but will be forced to make a new search for the finding of it.

Thus Dr. Hakewell. In reply to which let us observe first, that the Hebrew Words זָכַר and זִכְרוֹן, and the Chaldee זְכַרְיָא, are indifferently render'd in the Septuagint by MNHMH, and MNHMOΣTNON, (as also by ANAMNHΣΙΣ) *Memoria*, and *Memoriale*, as it appears in Kircher's Concordance, by many Examples; and therefore in some Places of our Bible, where Remembrance is in the Text we have Memorial in the Margin, as Psal. 97. 12. Secondly, We must observe of the Preposition ANTI, that it signifies first *pro*, FOR, as *pro* denotes *Loco*, *Vice*, instead, of which I need give no Examples; secondly it signifies *propter*, and *gratia*, as *gratia* is used in the Ablative Case; of which, not to bring Proofs out of *Lexicographers*, we have one in Hebr. xii. 16. Ὅς ANTI βεβήσως μίᾱς ἀπὸ δόλο, &c. Qui propter unam escam vendidit suum jus primogeniti, *Who for one Morsel of Meat sold his Birth-right*. So also it signifies *Matth. xx. 28.* and *Mark x. 45.* Ἀντὶ πολλῶν; *pro multis*, *The Son of Man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his Soul a Ransom for many.* And thirdly, with

with little Difference from this second Signification, it denotes the *end*, and signifies *pro*, *for*, in that Sense which the *Latins* also express by *ut*, or *eo ut*, as in 1 Cor. xi. 15. Ὅτι ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαῖς διδοῖ αὐτῇ, quoniam capilli *pro* velamine ei dati sunt, *for her Hair is given her for a Covering*, or Veil. Thirdly, We must observe that τὸ θυσίας in the contested Passage Μνήμην καὶ ἡμῶν ἁγιάδος ἀντὶ θυσίας πρὸς Θεῷ διηνεχῶς προσφέρειν may be taken *definitely*, as it denotes *the Sacrifice*, or *indefinitely*, as it may signify *a Sacrifice*, as Appellatives even with definite Articles often signify in the Greek Tongue.

These Distinctions being premised, I assert first that Μνήμην here signifies Μνημοζυον, a *Memorial*, viz. *the Bread, and Wine*, which was offered at the Consecration in Memory of that θαυμάσιον θῦμα *that wonderful Sacrifice*, which Eusebins in the next preceding Words saith Christ offered to his Father for the Salvation of Mankind, having appointed us to offer up the *Memorial* of the same to God, Ἀντὶ τὸ θυσίας. This quite enervates Dr. Hakewell's Objection, who asked how we could offer up a *Commemoration* for a Sacrifice, and declared he could not understand how *Commemoration*, being an Action, could be sacrificed, but the Bishop who vouches the Doctor, may understand how a *Memorial*, which is a *Substance*, or a thing by which a Commemoration is made, may be sacrificed; and so much in answer to that formidable Objection.

Farther this Expression of Eusebius, was apt, and apposite for a Writer of the Greek Church, where in the Form of Consecration, after *This is my Body*, &c. and *This is my Blood*, &c. *Do this in remembrance of me*, &c. it immediately follows MEMNHMENOI τοῦτον, &c. *We therefore being*

\* Constit. Apostol. lib. viii. cap. xii. Christian Priesthood,  
p. 121, 122. mindful

mindful of (or commemorating) his Passion, and Death, &c. do offer unto thee (our) King, and God, this Bread. and this Cup, according to his Institution, *Εὐχαριστῆς Σοὶ*, giving Thanks unto thee through him, for that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee, and execute the Priestly Office, and we beseech thee, who needest not any thing, to look with Complacency upon those Gifts now set before thee. Here we see the Commemoration made of the Sacrifice of our Lord, that *Σαυμάριον Σύμα*, and *σφαίριον ἑκαίριον*, by the Bread, and Wine, the Symbols of his Body, and Blood, at and in the Oblation of them to God the Father. They are the *Memorials, Monuments, and Representatives* of his dead Body, and effused Blood; and as it is usual in Authors to put one of two Concomitants for both, so admitting *μνήμην* to be taken for the *Action of Commemoration*, yet it connoting the Oblation of the Bread, and Wine in the H. Sacrament, by which the Commemoration was made, it was in effect to say that Christ appointed us daily to offer the *προσφοράν* or Oblation to God, at, in, and by which the Commemoration was made. By *μνήμην* therefore Eusebius could not but mean the *commemorative Oblation, or sacrificial Commemoration*, made by the Bread, and Wine in the H. Eucharist, for what he believed, with the Catholick Church, Christ had appointed, and joyn'd together, he could not design to put asunder. These two, like *Castor, and Pollux*, always formerly appeared at the Christian Altars, and were no more to be separated in the Eucharistical Service, than in the Passover of the Jews, the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, was to be separated from the solemn Commemoration of their Deliverance out of Egypt, or that Commemoration from the Sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb.

But



But to proceed : If τ̃ *ὑποίας* in this Passage is to be taken indefinitely, then it must be render'd thus, *After all Christ offering up in due manner such a wonderful Sacrifice, and superexcellent Victim to his Father, for the Salvation of us all; he instituted the Memorial [of it] that we should continually offer it to God for a Sacrifice.* So in the Latin Version:

*Itaque post omnia, quasi mirabilem quandam victimam, sacrificium eximium patri suo operatus, pro nostra omnium salute obtulit, ejusque rei memoriam, ut nos ipsi Deo pro Sacrificio offeremus, instituit.* The justness of this Translation will appear, if we may suppose that *Eusebius* speaking of the same Sacrifice of Christ, had in like manner said τ̃ ΤΥΠΟΝ καὶ ἱσθαιότις ἀρχαῖος Μωυσης ANTI ΘΥΣΙΑΣ τῷ Θεῷ ἐκαστὶς πρὸςφέρειν, *the Type whereof Moses instituted among the Jews, that they should offer it yearly to God for a Sacrifice.* I desire the Bishop to compare these two ways of speaking together, and then to tell me the Difference between MNHMHN and ΤΥΠΟΝ, or whether by the *Type* in the supposed latter Expression he would not understand the typical Lamb, or thing which was the *Type*, and not take *Type* in the Abstract for the Figure or Shadow, and thence argue like *Dr. Hakewell*, that a Figure, or Shadow, could not be sacrificed, or in propriety of Speech be called a Sacrifice.

But in case ANTI signified nothing else in the Gr. Tongue but *for*, as *for* signifies *instead*, yet taking τ̃ *ὑποίας* in this passage *definitely*, and *demonstratively*, for the wonderful Sacrifice of Christ mentioned immediately before μνήμην, *Dr. Hakewell's* Ob-

---

\* Μετὰ δὲ πάντα οἶον τι θαυμάσιον θύμα, καὶ σφαγίον ἔχον τὴν πάλαι καλλιεργησάμενην. καὶ τ̃ ἀπαντῶν ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκε σωτηρίας, MNHMHN καὶ ἡμῖν ἀρχαῖος ANTI ΘΥΣΙΑΣ τῷ Θεῷ διανεως προσφέρειν.

jection, viz. That *what is* instead of a Sacrifice cannot be indeed a Sacrifice, or of itself be properly so called: I say, upon this Supposition, the Doctor's Objection will fall to the Ground, because the Place then may be rendred thus: *After all, Christ offering up in due manner such a wonderful Sacrifice, and super-excellent Victim to his Father, for the Salvation of us All, He instituted the Memorial [of it] that we should continually offer it to God instead of the Sacrifice, that is instead of the Sacrifice of Christ, of which he spoke in the next preceding Words. And that the Bread and Wine were substituted in Place of the Body, and Blood of Christ, and the Oblation of them appointed to commemorate, and represent the Oblation of Christ upon the Cross in this H. Sacrament, I believe Dr. Hakewell, were he alive to reconsider the Subject, would not deny to have been the Doctrine of the ancient Catholick Church, nor perhaps will the Bishop deny it now. Of these two Senses, in which Eusebius's Words may be rendered, I will not determine which was his meaning, or the more probable of the two. But either of them fully answers the Cavils of Dr. Hakewell against Heylin, and justifies the latter against him, whose Objections, and Arguments against the Sacrifice, in the H. Eucharist, are all of the same cavilling, and trifling sort. Thus he argues against it, because it doth not answer to the Nature and Definition of a <sup>w</sup> Jewish Sacrifice, in which the sensible things sacrificed, were as to their Substance destroyed, and consumed, things having Life being killed, and things without Life, if solid, were burnt, if liquid poured forth, and spilt. Such Arguments also are the two following against the Bread, and Wine's be-*

<sup>w</sup> Dissertation with Dr. Heylin, p. 5, 6.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. p. 6, 7.

*ing the subject Matter of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, because it would overthrow the Unity of the Sacrifice, in as much as they are both often renewed, and in itself be of less Value, and Dignity, than many of the Jewish Sacrifices.* But what kind of arguing is this? For upon Supposition that the Bread and Wine are the Matter of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, as they are of the Eucharistical Sacrament; doth not the renewing of them in the Ministration of the Eucharist, *destroy the Unity of the one, as well as the other?* Or doth it destroy the Unity of the sacrificial or sacramental *Celebrity*, and *Ministration*, which as in publick Jewish, and Gentile Sacrifices was *one*, though many Sacrifices were offered not only numerically, but specifically distinct. Then as to the *Value*, and *Dignity*, if the Doctor means only the Market-Value, and Dignity of it, as it is plain he doth, it is an Objection not becoming a Divine, nor worthy of an Answer, but if he means the Representative, which may be called the spiritual Value, or sacramental Dignity of this Oblation, I shall hereafter shew that it is of more Value, and Dignity, than all the Sacrifices of the Jewish Church.

He saith in this Proposition, *the Eucharist is a representative Sacrifice, properly so called*; that he will easily grant it is *properly* representative, but *improperly* a Sacrifice; as he who represents a King is commonly called a King, yet in Propriety of Speech he cannot be so termed, unless he be a King in his own Person. To which I must reply, that the ancient Church every where literally, and properly offered up the *Bread, and Wine* to God the Father in the H. Eucharist, and taught that it was an Oblation appointed by Christ to represent, and commemorate the Oblation, or Sacrifice of himself upon the Cross; or that it was a

Sacrifice representative of that all-attoning, or full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice for the Sins of the World. And as a *King*, though but a *Regulus*, or petty King, who represents an *Augustus*, or other King a thousand times greater than himself, is *properly* a King, as well as *properly* a representative. So the Eucharistical Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine is *properly* a Sacrifice, as well, as *properly* representative. Upon which Account it is not only the most worthy, valuable, and venerable, but the most tremendous Sacrifice, that ever was offered by Man to God. This I have shew'd at large in my *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, and Dr. Heylin had sufficiently shew'd the same in his *Antidotum Lincolnense*, which as it appears from his Appendix to his *Examen Historicum*, Dr. Hakewell may very well be thought to have opposed out of *pique*.

He saith, he never heard that the Eucharistical Sacrifice of Christians was other than spiritual, but if he did not, he might have heard from the ancient Church-Writers that there was a material Oblation of Bread, and Wine, as well as a spiritual Sacrifice of concomitant Praise, and Thanksgiving in the H. Eucharist, which made them speaking of it, use such Phrases as these: *Προσφέρειν ὑμῖν Στοι*, &c. *we offer up unto thee this Bread, and this Cup*; in the Act of Consecration. But not to transcribe from what I have already written on this Subject, let me add some new Testimonies, as what is written in *Const. Apost. Lib. ii. c. 25.* where speaking of Bishops, he saith, *You are Ministers in the H. Catholick Church, who stand at the Altar of the Lord our God, to offer up unto him reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifices, through Jesus Christ the great High Priest.* And afterwards in the same Chapter: *What the Victims were then, Prayers, and Supplications, and giving of Thanks, are now; what First Fruits,*



Fruits, and Tithes, and <sup>y</sup> separate Portions, and Gifts were then, the Oblations are now, which the H. Bishops offer unto the Lord God through Jesus Christ, who dyed for them, for they are your High Priests, and the Presbyters your Priests. So *Lib. viii. cap. 28.* the Deacon doth not give the Blessing, nor baptize, nor offer, but when the Bishop, or Presbyter hath offered, he distributes to the People. So *lib. iii. cap. 10.* We do not permit Laicks any part of the sacerdotal Function, as to Sacrifice, &c. Here is also that Phrase, *εὐχαριστιαν ἀνοῦσαι* to offer the Eucharist; *lib. iv. cap. 58.* And in *lib. viii. cap. 47.* *Θυσίας, καὶ εὐχαριστίας ἀμίλεια, ἅτε γὰρ Ἀρχόντων προσφέρειν θυσίαν δέμιον, καὶ ὁ ἀνάληψιν αὐτῶ, ἡμεῖς προσενέγκοντες καὶ ὁ ὁρίζεσθαι αὐτῶ θυσίαν καθαρὰν, καὶ ἀνάμικτον περιχειρασάμεθα ἐποκόπας, &c.* The Contempt of the Sacrifice, and giving of Thanks: It is not lawful for the Deacon to offer Sacrifice. We [the Apostles] after his Assumption, offering a pure, and unbloody Sacrifice [or Oblation] <sup>z</sup> according to his Ordinance <sup>a</sup> ordained Bishops, &c.

Dr. Hakewell denies *hoc facite* in the Institution to have a *sacrificial* signification, or that *facere*, or *sacrificare* there are all one, because the Words of the Institution are doubtless directed to all the Faithful by St. Paul in the Church of Corinth, and in them to all Christians. So that, *saith he*, Dr. Heylin will be forced to prove his sacrificing from eating, and drinking, and withal to admit all Christians to do Sacrifice, against which he solemnly protests. But that doing of Sacrifice by the Christian People, against which, he saith, the Doctor protests, is doing of it, as Priests do it, by undertaking the H. Mi-

<sup>y</sup> Ἀφαιρέματα.

<sup>z</sup> Καὶ ὁ Διδάσκειν αὐτῶ in *cap. xii.* καὶ ὁ αὐτῶ Διδάσκειν.

<sup>a</sup> Clementis ad Cor. Epist. I. §. xlii.

nistrat[i]on thereof, against which the primitive Christian Writers remonstrate in great Abundance, as a piacular Crime, and the Sin of *Corab*. But Dr. *Heylin* could not be so absurd, as not to know that the People, both among Jews, and Gentiles, joyned in their publick Sacrifices with their Priests, by whose Hands they offered them upon the Altars of their respective Gods, and communicated with them of their Sacrifices in their sacrificial Feasts. *Facere* therefore, in the Words of the Institution, may properly signifie to *sacrifice* in both Senses, as the Priests and People are both said to sacrifice properly, when *these* offer by *their* Ministrat[i]on any material Oblation to any God. And thus the Christian People were both concerned in the *HOC FACITE* of the Eucharistical Oblations of Bread and Wine, which they brought to their *Liturgs*, or Priests, who out of their Oblations took *ἀσπασμῶν*, or holy Portions; and as I have shew'd in my Preface to my *second Collection of Controversial Letters*, and in *the Christian Priesthood*, solemnly offer'd them to God the Father, thro' Jesus Christ, according to his Institution. And therefore, as Dr. *Heylin* asserts, *HOC FACITE* in the *liturgical Sense* is solely, and properly for the Priest, who only hath Power to consecrate. And to shew the Vanity of this Cavil against Dr. *Heylin*, let me observe, that it destroys the Power of *consecrating*, as well as offering the Bread, and Wine in the Eucharist, because the Words of the Institution are directed to all the Faithful, in which it is not only said, *DO YE THIS*, but *DO YE THIS in Remembrance of me*. Which *doing* pertaineth not only to the Apostles (as he cites the Words of Bishop *Jewel* against *Harding*) but to the whole Congregation of *Corinth*; which is very true, but then it must be said, that as the Congregation offered, so it consecrated,

secrated, and performed the whole Eucharistical Service by the Ministration of the Priest, who therefore always administred in the *plural* Number, and particularly in the Consecration, when he said *προσφέρω σοι*, *we offer unto thee our King, and God, this Bread, and this Cup, &c.* But then he saith again, should we grant that *HOC FACITE* were to be referred only to the Actions of Christ himself, and directed only to the Apostles, and their Successors, yet it must first be proved, that Christ himself in the Institution of the Sacrament did offer a Sacrifice properly so called, which, saith he, for any thing that appears in the Text cannot be gathered from any Speech, which he then uttered, or Action, which he did, or Gesture which he used.

To which I answer, *first*, That in my *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood* I think I have fully proved, not only from the consentient Tradition of the Catholick Church both in Doctrine, and Practice, but from many Texts of Scripture, as understood by the best Christian Writers, that the *Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice*, and if that be as sufficiently proved, as many other Christian Doctrines which have no other, or better Proof, then it must follow, that it was a proper Sacrifice from the very Institution, in which Christ offered up the Bread, and Cup to his Father, in the Consecration, as I have shew'd the ancient Church did. This is a Demonstration *a posteriori*, as the Schools speak. But then in the *second* Place, I have in the same Discourse shew'd from the Testimony of the best Church-Writers, that our blessed Lord did offer up the Bread, and Cup, at the Institution of this H. Sacrament, as is also taught in *Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 46.* in the following Words: *προσφέρει τοις τῷ Θεῷ Ἀρχιερεὺς, &c.* *Wherefore Christ the only*

begotten [Son,] who was the first High Priest by <sup>b</sup> Nature, did not take this Honour of the Priesthood to himself, but was made a Priest by the Father; and being made Man for us, and offering a spiritual Sacrifice to his God, and Father, commanded us also to do [or offer] the same; and after his Assumption, we offering a pure and unbloody Sacrifice, according to his Command, &c. as in this Passage above-cited. And it is not to be imagined, that in the Consecration of the Elements, the Christian Priests of the ancient Church should tell God the Father, that they offered them unto him through Jesus Christ, according to his Ordinance, unless they believed that he offered them himself in the Institution of this blessed Sacrament. But *thirdly* it is not true, that there is no *Speech*, or *Action*, in the Text of the Institution; from whence it may be gathered, that he offered the Bread, and Cup, and by Consequence a Sacrifice *properly* so called unto his Father. For I have shew'd at large that ΤΟΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ, *do this*, is a sacrificial Phrase; and so λαβών, or ἔλαβε ἓ ἄρτον, *he took Bread*, is a sacrificial Speech, and imports a sacrificial Action, as in Gen. xxii. 13. it is said of *Abraham*, καὶ ἔλαβε ἓ κερὸν, *that he took the Ram*, and offered him for a burnt Offering; so Lev. iv. 30. καὶ λήψῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, *and the Priest shall take of the Blood thereof with his Finger*, and put it upon the Horns of the Altar; so ver. 34. καὶ λαβὼν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, *and the Priest shall take of the Blood of the Sin-Offering with his Finger*, and put it upon the Horns of the Altar. And so our Saviour may be supposed to have taken Bread from, or of, or out of the Portion of Bread upon the Table, to offer it unto his Father, in blessing it, or giving Thanks; and since the Words will fairly bear

---

<sup>b</sup> See Cotelerius's Note upon the Place.



this sacrificial Sense, and the ancient Church understood the Text in the same Sense, that he took the Bread, and Cup, and offered them up to his Father, it is a sufficient Proof that he offered a Sacrifice properly so called, and that it was for want of thorough Conversation with the ancient Fathers in their Writings, or rather great Pique, and Prejudice against Dr. Heylin, that occasion'd Dr. Hakewell to assert, That there was no Speech, which our Saviour uttered, nor any Action, that he did, from whence it might be gathered that he offered a Sacrifice in the H. Eucharist *properly* so called.

But he saith, that which confirms him in his Opinion, that the Eucharist is not a proper Sacrifice, is that both *Lombard*, and *Aquinas*, who term'd the Eucharist a Commemorative, yet held it to be an *improper* Sacrifice; *Lombard's* Sentences I have not by me, and therefore shall only consider the Words he produces out of *Aquinas*, which are these: *Quæritur, si quod gerit sacerdos propriè dicatur sacrificium, vel immolatio, & si Christus quotidie immoletur, vel semel tantum immolatus sit?* To which he answers, *Illud, quod offertur, & consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium, & oblationem, quia memoria, & representatio veri sacrificii, & sanctæ immolationis factæ in Ara Crucis.* Here the Question *Thomas* proposes, is, Whether the *Bread, and Wine*, quod gerit sacerdos, or *illud quod offertur & consecratur* may be properly called a Sacrifice, as Sacrifice signifies *immolatio*, a Sacrifice by Blood, and Slaughter, as that of Christ was upon the Cross, and by Consequence, whether Christ is daily thus sacrificed in the Eucharist, or once only upon the Cross? To which he answers, *illud quod offertur, & consecratur*, the Bread, and Wine, which are offered, and consecrated, are called a Sacrifice [in this Sense of immolation] because they  
are

are the Commemoration, and Representation of the *true* Sacrifice, and holy Immolation of Christ made upon the Altar of the Cross. Here therefore the Question is not whether there is a proper, external, material Oblation of Bread, and Wine in the Eucharist; for that *Aquinas* supposes by those Words, *istud quod gerit sacerdos*, and *istud quod offertur*, & *consecratur*, but whether that Oblation be a Sacrifice, as Sacrifice signifies *Immolation*, and whether Christ is so sacrificed in the Eucharist, as he was upon the Cross. But in this Sense none of our Writers take it for a real, true, or proper, but only for a *mystical* and spiritual Sacrifice, and Immolation of Christ upon the Cross, as it is a solemn Commemoration, and Representation thereof. The Word therefore *proper*, in Relation to the H. Sacrament, hath two Senses: one, as *proper* is opposed to *metaphorical*, and *allusive*; and the other as it is opposed to the Immolation, or bloody Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross; which two Senses our Adversaries always confound together. When therefore we assert the Eucharist to be a *proper* Sacrifice, or Oblation, we take the Word purely in the first Sense, meaning no more thereby, than that the Bread and Cup, like other *material*, and *external* Sacrifices, are really offered unto God, in the Eucharistical Service to be the sacramental Representation, and Commemoration of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, or the *mystical* Sacrifice of his Body, and Blood. These two different Senses of the Word *proper* are also more carefully to be observed, because many of our Writers, who believe the Eucharist to be a *proper* Oblation in the first Sense, yet often speak of it without premising any Distinction as an *improper* Sacrifice, only meaning in the second, as *Aquinas* doth in the Passage now examined. And to shew Dr. *Hakewell's* Error more abundantly,

ly, I will here demonstrate from other Passages, in *Quest. 183. Art. 4.* That he believed the H. Sacrament to be a proper Sacrifice in the first Sense: *sic igitur populo praparato, & instructo, consequenter accedit ad Celebrationem Mysterii*, quod quidem offertur ut Sacrificium, & consecratur, & sumitur ut Sacramentum.——Deinde sacerdos secreto commemorat pro quibus hoc Sacrificium offertur, *scilicet pro universali Ecclesia.*——Tertio, *petitionem concludit cum dicit, ut hac Oblatio omnibus, pro quibus offertur, salutaris sit.* Deinde accedit ad ipsam consecrationem in qua *quarto petit hoc Sacrificium peractum acceptum esse Deo.* Quinto *petit hujus Sacrificii, & Sacramenti effectum.*

The Reader may perceive from these Observations I have made, in answer to Dr. *Hakewell's* Dissertation, that Dr. *Heylin* had reason to write of it, as in the 'Margin, and I have been induc'd to examine it so particularly, not only for the Sake of the Bishop of *Norwich*, but of some others, who, as I am told, said they wonder'd I would write for the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, if I had read that *Dissertation*. I must therefore add in behalf of my self, and all others of

---

\* Appendix to the Advertisements on Mr. *Sanderson's* History at the end of Dr. *Heylin's Examen Historicum*. When the Respondent was under the Displeasure of the House of Commons, on the Complaint of Mr. *Pryn*, he published a Discourse against him in answer to some Passages in a Book entituled *Antidotum Lincolnense, &c.* which he entituled by the Name of a *Dissertation with Dr. Heylin whether the Eucharist properly so called, &c.* one of which Books being brought to the Respondent, as soon as it was come from the Press, he found it no such knotty Piece, but that it might easily have been cleft asunder without Wedge or Beetle, and he had returned an Answer to it, if some of Dr. *Hakewell's* Friends, seeing how weakly it was penn'd, and how unseasonably it was publish'd, had not took order to suppress it, and then suppress it with such Care, and friendly Diligence, that within three or four Days after the first coming of it out, there was not a Book of them to be had for Love or Money.

the

the Church of *England*, who have written to prove the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, that we have written nothing in the main of our own Phancies, or from the particular Notions of two or three Fathers; but from the general Doctrine of them all, and the Practice of all the Christian World, in primitive as well as later times, before the Reformation<sup>d</sup>. *The Opinions, and Usages we maintain are not particular, but Catholick and general; neither have we engaged our selves to maintain them out of Party, but for the Love of Truth; much less are they our Phancies, but real Notions, verifys'd by Doctrine, and Practice, which we have not set up for Shibboleths to distinguish our selves, but with the most noble, and charitable, and rewardable Design of restoring the Holy Sacrament to its complete, and adequate Notion, and Ministration, as it was taught, and practis'd in the primitive Church. Now as to the other Reflections of this Author, upon this Doctrine, and the Maintainers of it, they are silly, false, and spiteful; first silly in ascribing the Divisions of the Church to them, whereas if the Doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice be the Truth, the primitive Truth, then the Divisions of the Church are to be charg'd upon those, who will not embrace, but oppose this Truth; for Truth can never be the true, but only the accidental Cause, or mere Occasion of Divisions, for which they are answerable to God, and Man, that oppose Truth. Another may after the Doctor's Example ascribe the Divisions of the Church to the maintaining of Episcopacy, which hath accidentally, occasion'd more, and more violent Divisions, than the Doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice; and therefore it was in the second place both false and spiteful to ascribe the Miseries of the*

---

<sup>d</sup> Dr. Nichols's Preface to his Common-Prayer Book, p. 13.



Civil War (which he might have call'd a Rebellion) not to the Separatists, and Sectaries, but to the Quarrels, and Differences of the Church of *England*-Men themselves; that is, as his Meaning must be interpreted, to that part of them, who wrote for the Christian Sacrifice, and it may be for other *high Doctrines*, as *Episcopacy*, and *Non-Resistance*, which have also caus'd, that is accidentally caus'd, many Divisions in the Church, and the Miseries consequent thereupon. But to confirm his unjust Reflections, he asserts contrary to all History, that the Separatists, and Sectaries were broach'd after the Civil War in *Cromwell's* Army. But were there no *Brownists*, no *Anabaptists*, no *Puritan* Factions, no *Presbyterians* before the Civil War? Nor did *Junius Brutus*, *Martin Marprelat*, and innumerable other Libels mention'd in Historians, and cited by Bishop *Bancroft*, and others contribute nothing to the kindling of it? Nor were there then no false Churchmen, who help'd to begin it, and pull down the Monarchy and Church. Oh! how do we want another *Heylin* to chastise, and expose the false Historians and Misrepresenters of the former Reigns! But particularly, as to us, who maintain, that the Church always offer'd the Creatures of Bread and Wine in the Holy Sacrament, Mr. *Baxter*, who began to read the ancient Fathers in his old Age, as *Cato* learned *Greek*, will teach the Doctor more Candor, Justice, and Moderation towards us; and to him I refer him in the *Appendix*, N<sup>o</sup>. 7. p. cccxx. and to his *Christian Directory*, p. 882. I am confident were he now alive, he would not so severely, and unjustly censure us, as the Doctor doth; nor would suggest, as if we wrote with an evil Intention to introduce the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass, as some others lately have done against all Reason,  
and

and Charity: First, because, as Dr. <sup>c</sup> *Hakewell* truly observes, *the Commemoration or Representation of a thing must both in Nature, and Propriety of Speech be distinct from the thing it commemorates, and represents*; and, Secondly, because most of the Writers for the Eucharistical Sacrifice have also been most eminent Writers against the Church of Rome, in defence of the Church of England, from Bishop *Andrews*, Mr. *Mede*, Archbp. *Laud*, &c. to the Writers of this present time. These scandalous Reflections are much fitter for such a Charge as that of the *Scorriſh* Commissioners against Archbishop *Laud*; and those who make them, write so like them, that one might think they copied from their Original, tho' I verily believe not with the same Design.

I am sorry I have another Occasion given me by the Bishop of *Norwich* from concluding, by what he hath said of Mr *Thorndike*, than whom none hath written more elaborately to prove, that the Eucharist is an external Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine to God, in which the People communicated with the Priest, as in *Peace-Offerings*. But then for fear he should be misunderstood, as if he thought it to be the real, proper, propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ, which as a Sacrament it only represents: He <sup>c</sup> declares, that it is the Sacrifice of Christ only *mystically*, or *sacramentally*, as appears from his own Words: *Now that in the sense of the Catholick Church the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a Sacrifice propitiatory for the Church, and impetratory of the Necessities thereof in regard of those Prayers, wherewith it is offered, and presented unto God, in Virtue of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which it is mystically, that is, repre-*

---

<sup>c</sup> Dissertation, p. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Epilogue, cap. iii. p. 50.

senterb and commemorateth, &c. So in p. 39. Now this will first infer, that it is Bread, and Wine which our Lord feeds us with in the Eucharist; and again that it hath the virtue of sustaining us, by being made the Body and Blood of Christ, as in a Sacrament, by virtue of the Consecration pass'd upon it, which is all that I say to a hair, that by being made a Sacrament, it becomes the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, to be feasted upon by Christians. So more plainly p. 40. It is not any Disparagement to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross,— that the Eucharist should be counted the Sacrifice of Christ crucified mystically, and as in a Sacrament, &c. It is in this sense only, that Mr. Thorndike, to avoid the Imputation of being for the Popish Sacrifice, asserts the Eucharistical Oblation not to be the real but mystical Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, which it represents; and for this he observes, that when the Fathers call the Eucharist by the Name of a Sacrifice, and the Celebration thereof the Death and Passion of Christ, their Meaning is not literal, or to be taken in Property of the Words, but figuratively, or with abatement from the literal Meaning of them, as, saith he, is evident from the addition of other Words, which they use, as *reasonable, commemorative, unbloody, symbolical, sign, image, &c.* Thus also, as the Bp. of N. observes, he applies the Words of St. Chrysostome out of his xviii<sup>th</sup> Homily on the Epistle to the Hebrews; where after he had said, *He is our High Priest who offered the Sacrifice that cleanseth us; the same we also offer, which then was offer'd, the unconsumable [Sacrifice]. This is done in remembrance of that, which was then done; for do this, saith he, in remembrance of me. We make not another Sacrifice, as the High Priest then did, but we offer always the same; then he adds, or rather the Remembrance of a Sacrifice.* This indeed is an

Abatement to shew that the Eucharist in the Consecration was not properly speaking offered by the Church as the real, but only as the symbolical, mystical, and sacramental Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, which it did set forth, and represent. But then it doth not at all relate to the proper external Oblation of Bread, and Wine to be made by Consecration the mystical Body, and Blood of Christ, of which none of the Ancients is more full and expresse than St. Chrysostome, as I have shewed in *the Christian Priesthood*; nor none of the Modern more clear for it than Mr. Thorndike, as I have shew'd in the *Prefatory Answer* to the Book of the *Rights*; and as his Lordship may also see in his Book of *Religious Assemblies*, though he hath been so unfortunate, as by mistake to represent both their Meanings, and in his mistake almost to triumph in the following Words: *One such Expression in any Father, [as this of St. Chrysostome] where he speaks accurately, as correcting his own Words, is more from binding the Eucharist from being a proper Sacrifice, than a thousand Expressions unguarded, and at large, can make it to be one.* Indeed one such Expression relating to the Oblation of the Elements in the Eucharist that Oblation is figuratively called, and not as the Sacrifice of Christ, might be an Argument to prove it not to be a proper Sacrifice; but in this sense there are no such abating Expressions from the sacrificial Notion of the Eucharistical Oblation, in any of the Fathers: But as a King, or a Peer, who represents another King or Peer, is himself a proper King or Peer, but improperly the King or Peer he represents; so the Oblation of the Elements in the Eucharist is a proper Sacrifice, and properly so called, though it is only the mystical, and by consequence the improper Sacrifice of that, which it represents; for as Mr. Thorndike observes,

serves<sup>e</sup>,



serves<sup>e</sup>, as the Sacrifices of the old Law were nevertheless Sacrifices, though they were Figures, and Types of the one Sacrifice of the Cross; so is the Sacrifice of the New Testament nevertheless a proper Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine; tho' it sets forth, and represents the same Sacrifice, of which the Legal Sacrifices were Types. Wherefore as to be a Type did not destroy the proper Nature, and Notion of a legal Sacrifice: so neither doth it destroy the proper Nature, and Notion of the Evangelical to be a Representation; to typify, and adumbrate was consistent with the proper Idea of the one, and so to represent, and commemorate is consistent with the true, and proper Idea, and Conception of the other, what a Dust soever its Adversaries may raise to darken, and obscure the ancient, and easy Notion thereof. It hath the Honour above all the Sacrifices that ever were to be the *Representative* of the Sacrifice of the Cross; and the Value, and Dignity of it above all other Sacrifices, consists in being the Representative of that propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the whole World. It was instituted by our Lord for that noble and adorable Purpose, and therefore were I to define the Eucharistical Sacrifice, it should be in these Forms: The Eucharistical Sacrifice is an Oblation of Bread, and Wine instituted by Jesus Christ to represent, and commemorate his Sacrifice upon the Cross. Wherefore to represent, and commemorate the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, being the great End of its Institution, and the special part of its Definition, by which it differs from, and is dignify'd above all other Sacrifices: It may be said of it in this respect, *We offer a Sacrifice, or rather the Remembrance of a Sacrifice*; without meaning that it is

---

<sup>e</sup> Epilogue, Book III. ch. v. p. 40.

not a proper Sacrifice, but only intending to set forth its supereminent Dignity above all other Sacrifices, in being instituted for a Remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ. So speaking of an Anniversary Festival instituted in Remembrance of any great Deliverance, we may say, without meaning that it is not a *proper* Festival, we keep a Feast, or *rather the Remembrance* of such a Deliverance. Such like Expressions on such Occasions, are not to be construed as spoken by way of *Correction* of what was said before, as his *Lordship* saith, but as spoken to express the great, and noble Ends, for which *Solemnities* were instituted, and for which they are observed, and by which they are distinguish'd from all other Solemnities of the same kind. They are exegetical Expressions, and of *Emphasis*, not of *Correction*; and therefore where-ever they are us'd, it must be consider'd in which of the two senses the Author uses them, and whether or no they hinder the thing spoken of before to be properly what it is called.

I could not pass over his *Lordship's* Argument against the Eucharistical Sacrifice from these Words of St *Chrysostome*, without an Answer; and therefore I conclude it with saying, that they are so far from hindring the Eucharist from being a *proper* Sacrifice, that they do not hinder the following Passages of that Father from proving it to be such: <sup>h</sup> ἡ ὁλοκαυτωμένη ἡ αὐτῆς ὅσι, &c. *The Oblation is the same, whosoever offers it: Be it Paul, or be it Peter, it is the same, which Christ gave to his Disciples,* <sup>i</sup> and which the Priests now offer; for *this is not* inferior to that, because they are not Men, who consecrate *this*, but *he* [that is Christ] *who conse-*

<sup>h</sup> Homil. ii. in 2 Tim. cap. i.

<sup>i</sup> Καὶ ἡ ὅσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

crated that. For as the Words which <sup>k</sup> Christ spoke then are the very same which the Priest speaks now: *so is the Oblation the same.* So in his Homily, *De proditiōe Juda*, saith the Priest, *This is my Body; which Words change the <sup>l</sup> Gifts set before God.* I humbly intreat his *Lordship* to consider that Phrase in the first Passage, *because they are not Men who consecrate this, but Christ who consecrated that*, and then to tell me whether he used that Expression as a *Correction* of what he had said before, and so hinder our Consecration from being a *proper* Consecration? Or whether he spoke only *emphatically* to instruct the People, that Christ was the principal Consecrator of the Elements by our Hands, and we only the instrumental, subordinate, and ministerial Consecrators of them under him, and by his Authority.

I have been necessitated to write all this upon mentioning the Additions which I have made in this Edition of my Book, to what I had said in the former of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, but now I have done for ever with that Subject, and with all others that will require such Labour and Study, as through Age and Infirmities I am no longer able to endure. If it meets with any more Opposition, I leave the farther Defence of it to those learned younger Divines, or Students of Divinity, who are conversant in the ancient Writers of the Church. God of his Mercy to it increase the Number of them, and thereby supply the great Loss of the late Mr. John Hughes, Fellow of Jesus Collage in Cambridge, whose untimely Death (if any thing may be so called which God appoints) I can never mention without Grief, and scarce with dry Eyes.

As for the Additions I have made in my Discourse

of the *Dignity of the Episcopal Office*, I need not tell what, and where they are. They are intermixt with the rest, and I have nothing more to say of them, but to desire the learned Reader to observe how many Testimonies there are in it for the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, and the sacerdotal power of *forgiving Sins*, as well as for the *Distinction of the Church from the State*, and the *Independence of that upon this*; of which the Bishop saith, *All which I am persuaded are erroneous in the manner they have been urged, and no way agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England.* He also insinuates that the chief Promoters of these Opinions are of the late Separation, which is his Lordship's Mistake, as he may see in the *Presatory Discourse*, and in the *Appendix*, N. 7. and therefore it was not with too much Candour or Justice that he was pleased to say, *he hoped they should not easily let us make more Divisions among them, nor be forward to entertain what we urge, (as his Phrase is) purely because it seems to magnify our Office.*

I think my self to have a particular share in the Honour of this Reflection, for which I have given no just Cause. And therefore to shew his Lordship that what he hath said of two of those *three Doctrines*, and the Honour and Dignity of the sacerdotal Office, which he thinks I magnify too much, is not right and just, I have added several Tracts to the *Appendix*, which will justify me against his Lordship's Reflections, by shewing that I have spoken soberly, and not above Measure, of the Church's Independency of the State, and the Dignity of the Priesthood, and that I have not delivered any other Doctrines on that Subject than learned Men before me have done, in as high, if not in



higher Terms. Two of these Tracts are of the Church's Independency, whereof one is a Preface of *Du Pin* before a Dissertation, in which he shews that the Church hath no Authority, direct or indirect, to depose Kings, or discharge their Subjects from their Allegiance. The other is a Tract of *Isaac Casaubon*, *De Libertate Ecclesiastica*, translated by the same learned Hand into *English*, which translated the Answer to Mr. *de Fontenel's* History of Oracles, and the Continuation of it in Answer to *le Clerc*.

This Treatise never came to my Knowledge 'till it was lately published with the Author's Epistles in *Holland*. And both in this, and the other Treatise, the Bishop will find some high things on the Argument, which I declined to say, least I should give Offence. In particular it must be observed of *Isaac Casaubon*, that he could not have any Temptation to write on purpose, *purely to magnify the Priestly Office*, or transgress the *proper Bounds* of his Subject, or say any thing upon it, that should give the *State any just Apprehensions* of the Church and Clergy, as his Lordship suggests we have done; for as he was one of the greatest Men that ever lived, so he was bred, if not born, in *Geneva*, lived and dyed a *Layman*, and wrote this *Treatise of the true Estate of the Church against the Papal Supremacy and Usurpations of the Church, as perverted by the Court of Rome*. Nothing but the pure Evidence of Truth, as he found it in the ancient Church-Writers, could have made him write so impartially of the true, and false, or real and pretended Liberty of the Church, as he hath done in the Treatise; and as his Lordship may rectify his own wrong Notions by his right

of the *Dignity of the Episcopal Office*, I need not tell what, and where they are. They are intermixt with the rest, and I have nothing more to say of them, but to desire the learned Reader to observe how many Testimonies there are in it for the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, and the *sacerdotal power of forgiving Sins*, as well as for the *Distinction of the Church from the State*, and the *Independence of that upon this*; of which the Bishop saith, *All which I am persuaded are erroneous in the manner they have been urged, and no way agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England.* He also insinuates that the chief Promoters of these Opinions are of the late Separation, which is his Lordship's Mistake, as he may see in the *" Prefatory Discourse*, and in the *Appendix*, N. 7. and therefore it was not with too much Candour or Justice that he was pleased to say, *he hoped they should not easily let us make more Divisions among them, nor be forward to entertain what we urge*, (as his Phrase is) *purely because it seems to magnify our Office.*

I think my self to have a particular share in the Honour of this Reflection, for which I have given no just Cause. And therefore to shew his Lordship that what he hath said of two of those *three Doctrines*, and the Honour and Dignity of the sacerdotal Office, which he thinks I magnify too much, is not right and just, I have added several Tracts to the *Appendix*, which will justify me against his Lordship's Reflections, by shewing that I have spoken soberly, and not above Measure, of the Church's Independency of the State, and the Dignity of the Priesthood, and that I have not delivered any other Doctrines on that Subject than learned Men before me have done, in as high, if not in

higher Terms. Two of these Tracts are of the Church's Independency, whereof one is a Preface of *Du Pin* before a Dissertation, in which he shews that the Church hath no Authority, direct or indirect, to depose Kings, or discharge their Subjects from their Allegiance. The other is a Tract of *Isaac Casaubon*, *De Libertate Ecclesiastica*, translated by the same learned Hand into *English*, which translated the Answer to Mr. *de Fontenel's* History of Oracles, and the Continuation of it in Answer to *le Clerc*.

This Treatise never came to my Knowledge 'till it was lately published with the Author's Epistles in *Holland*. And both in this, and the other Treatise, the Bishop will find some high things on the Argument, which I declined to say, least I should give Offence. In particular it must be observed of *Isaac Casaubon*, that he could not have any Temptation to write on purpose, *purely to magnify the Priestly Office*, or transgress the *proper Bounds* of his Subject, or say any thing upon it, that should give the *State any just Apprehensions* of the Church and Clergy, as his Lordship suggests we have done; for as he was one of the greatest Men that ever lived, so he was bred, if not born, in *Geneva*, lived and dyed a *Layman*, and wrote this *Treatise of the true Estate of the Church against the Papal Supremacy and Usurpations of the Church, as perverted by the Court of Rome*. Nothing but the pure Evidence of Truth, as he found it in the ancient Church-Writers, could have made him write so impartially of the true, and false, or real and pretended Liberty of the Church, as he hath done in the Treatise; and as his *Lordship* may rectify his own wrong Notions by his right

ones, and particularly see to how little purpose in his *Appendix* he hath brought so many Examples from Christian Emperors employing their imperial Power for the Good and Service of the Church, to prove that it is not independent of the State. In short, I think his *Lordship* may find a satisfactory Answer to all that he hath written, both in his *Charge*, and in his *Appendix*, against the Independence of the Church, if he will read it without Prejudice, and not doubting but he will consider it well, I must refer him to it for his Conviction, and Satisfaction, and hope it will convince him, that wherein I am so unhappy as to have him differ from me, he is in the wrong, and that I am in the right.

And then because he is pleased to write, as if I had magnified the Priestly Office too much, I have added what two great Men, Dr. <sup>p</sup> George Downan afterwards Bishop of *L. Derry* and Dr. <sup>a</sup> Jackson have said on that Subject, and to those Additions I also humbly refer his *Lordship* for second Thoughts, and my own Justification, and I hope when he reads them he will be more candid towards me, unless he can also think that what they have written on that Subject, they urge purely because it magnifies the Priestly Office. But what I have said on the Independent Power, the Right to offer Sacrifice, and the Commission to forgive Sins, I have urged, as he speaks, to magnify the sacerdotal Office: Have I not abundantly shew'd that the most holy Fathers have done the same? Did not St. Paul magnify the Apostolick Office from the Apostles being Christ's Ambassadors, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and challenge the Esteem, and Obedience of the People upon that account? And would it not look more like the Speech of a *Deist*, than of a true and faithful



Christian, to say, *that we should not be forward to entertain, what he urged purely to magnify our Office, before we have thoroughly consider'd it.* As to the Power of offering Sacrifice, and the Commission of forgiving Sins, the one, as well as the other, is to be found in the Primitive Form of consecrating a Bishop, which I have cited, and translated in the *Christian Priesthood*, p. 134, 135. where I must observe that in the Greek between the Words Ἰησοῦς Χριστῷ, and οὗ ἐστὶν Στοι, are left out by Chance τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι ἡμῶν, of which the Reader may be pleased to take notice. And then particularly as for the Power, I mean the ministerial Power of sacrificing, his Lordship may find that urged to magnify the *Priesthood*, in *St. Clement's 1 Epist. ad Cor.* § xlv. and by *St. Cyprian Epist. i.* and lxvii. which with others I do not cite at large here, because they are so cited in my Book. But if we must be censured, and censured by Bishops, for magnifying the Priest's Office from these Powers, then I can only say, with *St. Clement*, in the Place just now cited: Μακάριοι οἱ προσεσώπορησαντες πρεσβυτέρω ὅτι τινες ἐγκαρπον καὶ τελειὰν ἔχοντες ἀνάλυσιν, καὶ γὰρ ἐυλαβέοντες μὴ, τις αὐτοὺς μελασθήσῃ ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδρυμένης αὐτοῖς τῆς.

But then, as none of those three Doctrines, which his Lordship charges us to have stretched for the Honour of the Clergy, are more lyable to vulgar Misconstruction, or apter to create in the People an ill Opinion of it, than that of the Power of forgiving Sins, I must intreat his Lordship to explain what he means in saying we have advanced the Power of sacerdotal Absolution in such a manner, as if there was a Power of forgiving Sins, properly speaking, lodged in the Church, or the Priests and Ministers of it; for first, if by the Power of forgi-

\* Charge, p. 19.

giving Sins, properly speaking, he means an absolute arbitrary Power of forgiving without the Condition of Repentance, as well as with it, I must beg leave to say, that I think it is not in the Power of God himself to forgive Sins without Repentance, there being a necessary, and eternal Congruity between Pardon, and Penitence. So that Repentance is not a positive, but a natural Condition to qualify the Sinner even for God's Pardon; and I never heard of any Man who was so mad as to assert, that it was in the Power of the Church, or her Priests, to forgive Sins in this sense. But secondly, if by the Power of forgiving Sins, properly speaking, he means an original, immediate, principal, or Architectonical Power, which in temporal Pardons belongs to Kings, and in spiritual Pardons only, and properly speaking, to God, (in which Sense it is said, *who can forgive Sins, but God alone?*) Then I must say again, I never knew any Man so abandoned to Truth, and good Sense, as to assert, that the Church or her Ministers had Power to forgive Sins in this sense, as in temporal Cases it belongs to the sovereign Power, and in spiritual to God alone. But then if by the Power of forgiving Sins, properly speaking, he means as he ought to mean, that conditional ministerial, derivative Power of forgiving Sins, which God in a proper sense, or properly speaking, hath committed to his Church and her Priests, then I acknowledge, that not only we upon whom his Lordship would be understood to reflect, but all the ancient, and sober modern Writers upon the Power of Absolution, have asserted such a Power of forgiving Sins to be lodged in the Church, and the Priests of it, by Derivation and Commission from God, as it is written *Job. xx. 23. whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.* In this sense  
of

of remitting Sins, those very Writers which he cites do assert the Power of forgiving Sins, properly speaking, to be lodged in the Church, and her Priests. Mr. Thorndike asserts it in the Passages which his Lordship cites, and he will pardon me, if I say, I think to no purpose, but more expressly in the Passages, to which I here refer him, as well as the Reader, for the Justification of those upon whom he reflects. *'The Power of the Keys is the Foundation of the Church, and is seen more towards them that are already of the Church, than them (the Catechumens) that are not of it.—Therefore tho' the power of the Keys is seen in free admitting to the Communion of the Church, yet it is more visible in excluding from the same, as well as in readmitting to it. Inward Repentance—is a Disposition qualifying a Man for the pardon of Sin by virtue of the Covenant of Grace, without the Act of the Church passing upon it. But God hath charged his Church, and therefore given it power and right to call all those, who notoriously transgress that Christianity, which once they have professed to those Demonstrations of inward Repentance, and Amendment of Mind by visible Actions that may satisfy the Church, that God's Wrath, in regard of that Sin, is appeased through Christ, and upon those Demonstrations to readmit them to Communion with the Church.*

And farther, God having provided this means of procuring and assuring the pardon of Sin by the Church, hath also obliged all Christians to make use of the same, by bringing their secret Sins to the knowledge of the Church, so far, and in as much as they ought to stand Convict, that the Ministry of the Church is requisite to procure in them that Disposition, which by

---

<sup>1</sup> Epilogue of the Laws of the Church, ch. ix. p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> P. 74.

*the Gospel entitles them to Forgiveness. The Scripture doth evidence, that God hath instituted and appointed the Ministry of this Church for the reconciling of those Sins, which must, or which may come to the Knowledge of the Church. For when God giveth first to St. Peter the Keys of his Church, Matth. xviii. 19. and afterwards to all his Disciples the Power of binding, and loosing Sins, Joh. xx. 19, &c. But he that thinketh that within the Church, the power of the Keys goes no farther than preaching, &c. And if our Lord by inscribing immediately a general promise of bearing the Prayers of Christians, intended to intimate, that he would accept of the Prayers of the Church for reconciling of those, whose Sins were bound, as I observed before, then of Necessity something more, than shewing of the Guilt of Sin by preaching, is referred to the Church, in procuring the loosing him that is bound from the debt of Sin, not from the scandal of it. To the same purpose he speaks at large in p. 79. But he who is thus recovered to Life by the Ministry of the Church, is not yet loosed of the Bands of his Sin, till he be loosed by the Church, because he was first bound by it; as our Lord having raised Lazarus to life, commands him to be loosed by the Apostles. For if he, who accepteth of the Gospel, and the Terms of it, remains bound to be baptized by the Church for the Remission of Sins, is it strange that he, who hath forfeited his pardon obtained by the Church, even in the Judgment and Knowledge of the Church, should not obtain the restoring of it but by the Act of the Church? And therefore the Church remitteth Sin after Baptism, not only as a Physician prescribing the Cure, but as a Judge admitting it to be effected. And the satisfaction of the Church presupposeth, that God is satisfied, that is to*

---

<sup>v</sup> Ibid. p. 77.

<sup>w</sup> P. 78.

<sup>x</sup> P. 82.



say, his Wrath appeased, and his Favour regained by means, which the Church prescribeth, but requireth also that he submit not only to use the Cure the Church prescribeth, but to the Judgment thereof in admitting to the Effect of it.— There are many more strong and plain Expressions in this Author for the power of the Keys, and the Exercise of them, too long to be transcribed, particularly in p. 84, 85, 91, 97, 205. Some of which are more especially to be observed, as where he asserts that *the greatest part of Christians are bound in Conscience to have recourse to the power of the Church, and the Keys thereof, for the Cure of those Sins, which are not in themselves notorious.* And therefore he is for the Confession of secret Sins, for which he vouches the Authority of *Origen*, and

---

<sup>7</sup> *Hom. 2. in Ps. xxxii. Vide ergo quid edocet nos scriptura divina, quia oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus, fortassis enim sicut ii, qui habent intus inclusam escam indigestam, aut humoris, vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter, & moleste imminencia, si vomuerint, relevantur: Ita etiam hi qui peccaverunt, si quidem occultant, & retinent intra se peccatum, intrinsecus urgentur, & prope modum suffocantur, phlegmate vel humore peccati. Si autem [peccator] ipse sui accusatur fiat, dum accusat seipsum, & confitetur, simul evomat & delictum atque omnem morbi digerit causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum: Proba prius Medicum, cui debeas causam languoris exponere, qui sciat infirmari cum infirmante, flere cum flente, qui condolendi, & compatiendi noverit disciplinam, ut ita demum si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius & eruditum medicum ostenderit, & misericordem si quid consilii dederit facias, & sequaris: si intellexerit, & providerit talem esse languorem tuum, qui in conventu totius Ecclesiae exponi debeat, & curari, ex quo fortassis, & ceteri edificari poterunt, & tu ipse facile Sanari, multa hoc deliberatione, & satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est. Quoniam iniquitatum ego meam pronuntiabo, & cogitabo pro peccato meo. Quicumque vestrum conscius sibi est in aliquo peccato, & ita securus est, ut nihil mali fecerit, commoveatur ex hoc Sermone, qui dicit, Cogitabo pro peccato meo. And who is meant by the Physician, to whom Origen would have the Sinner confess, is plain from the beginning of his first Homily on this Psalm.—Requirant aptam & convenientem*

and farther <sup>2</sup> saith, that he must freely glorify God in freely professing, that no Christian Kingdom or State can maintain it self to be what it pretendeth, more effectually, than by giving force and effect to the Law of private Confession once a Year. And what is also to be observed by his Lordship, is, that one Reason he gives why the godly Discipline of putting notorious Sinners to Penance at the Beginning of *Lent* could not take Place at the Reformation, was <sup>3</sup>, that the Tares of Puritanism were sowed together with the Grain of Reformation of the Church of England. It is very true what he asserts, that the Church hath no Power to forgive Sins immediately, nor to pardon any Persons Sin without that disposition of true Repentance, which qualifieth a Man for it, without which the Act of the Church in loosing Sinners is ineffectual. In which Sense the Saying of Firmilian cited by our Author out of Cyprian is true, that Penitents do not obtain Remission of Sins from, or by the Act of the Church, but by their own Repentance; but then he asserts on the other hand, that God hath appointed the Ministry of the Church for the Reconcilement of those Sins, which come to the Knowledge of the Church; and that the Act of the Church is as necessary to readmit publick Penitents, as at first to admit Catechumens, when qualified, to become the Disciples of Christ. He also asserts, as the Bishop observes, that a Man's

---

entem sibi rationabilem disciplinam, quæ eis ex præceptis Dei possit mederi. Nam tradidit & Medicinæ artis industriam, cujus Archiatros est salvator dicens de se, quoniam non opus habent, qui sani sunt, medico, sed qui male habent. Et ille quidem erat Archiatros, qui posset curare omnem languorem, & omnem infirmitatem: Discipuli vero ejus Petrus vel Paulus, sed & Prophetæ Medici sunt, & hi omnes, qui post Apostolos in Ecclesia positi sunt, quibus quoque curandorum vulnerum disciplina Commissa est, quos voluit Deus in Ecclesia suos esse medicos Animarum. Both these Homilies are worthy to be read by all Clergy-men.

<sup>2</sup> P. 104<sup>3</sup> P. 205.

own Christianity may supply the Means of Forgiveness, where there is no Remission by the Keys of the Church, as in the Case of *Clave errante*, where the Bishop by Prejudice, or too much Severity, keeps bound those, whom he ought to loose; of which there is a terrible Censure, *Const. Apost. lib. II. cap. xxi.* And here in answer to the Bishop I must profess, that I know none of the Church of *England*, who have written of the *Power of the Keys*, or *sacerdotal Absolution* without these Exceptions, Restrictions, and Abatements. As for my own Justification I must inform his Lordship, I did it in my *Prefatory Answer* to the Book of the *Rights*, as he may find it, *p. cxix.* There he may find from *St. Cyprian*, that *sacerdotal Absolution* hath no effect, where the Penitent deceives the Church, and her Ministers appointed to loose Sinners; and there are several Cases more too long to be considered here; as when a Priest for filthy Lucre absolves a Sinner, whom he ought to keep bound. This as odious a Case and as scandalous as it is, was the Case of *Zosimus the Presbyter*; who as it appears from above thirty Epistles of *Isidorus Pelusiota* to him, was one of the vilest, and most scandalous for several Vices, but particularly for Avarice, and Luxury, that ever was in the Church of God. This Fellow abusing his Priestly Character, and Profession, for <sup>b</sup> *filthy Lucre's sake*, absolved a perjur'd Person for a Dish of Fish, without obliging him to make Restitution to the innocent Person injur'd by his Perjury; for which Wickedness, *Isidore* tells him of one, who said he was worthy to be put to Death; and then telling him how he had perverted, and depraved the Gospel, he saith that the Power of Loosing is to be understood of those, who are penitent; that he is not loosed, who sweetens the Priest by Gifts, but he, who satisfies the

<sup>b</sup> *Isidor. lib. iii. c. 260. Κεῖς δὲς ἔσενεν αἰσχρῶ.*

injur'd Person, to whom he did wrong. And then most excellently setting forth his great Abuse of the Priestly Power, and the Place of the Gospel, upon which it is grounded, in Expressions too long to be transcribed, he tells him, that Priests were λειτουργοί, & κοινωνοί, *only Ministers, not Consorts, or Parcenors* [with the <sup>b</sup> Holy Ghost] of the Power of Absolution; ἀρεσβεις & κατωι, *Legates, or Deputies*, who ought to act within the Limits of their Commission, and not [Civil] Judges, whose mistaken or unjust Judgments acquit Criminals. Μεσιῖ, & Βασιλεις, *Mediators*, who absolve Penitents by their Prayers, and Intercessions for them, and not *Kings*; who can pardon or not pardon, as they please; <sup>c</sup> *For they, as the Apostle speaks, who offer Sacrifices for their own sins, cannot as by their own arbitrary power forgive sins to Impenitents, though they are never so rich, &c.* I believe there is not one of those, upon whom his Lordship reflects for advancing the Power of Sacerdotal Absolution, but who will give their Assent to every Word of *Isidore's* Letter to that wicked *Zosimus*, and would write such another to any Priest now upon the same Occasion. Nay I dare say, that learned and pious *Laick*, whom he singles out in his Reflections, will approve the whole of this Epistle to that wicked Priest; and therefore I hope his Lordship will pardon me for saying, that he hath cited it to no purpose against him. I confess the Expressions he cites out of him seem a little unguarded, but the Substance of what he writes is true, and may be admitted with a very little candid Allowance, and Abatement from the strict manner, in which he expresses his Meaning; for the Bishop will not, I believe, deny that sacerdotal Absolution is ordinarily necessary for the Remission of Sins, even of those, who are truly pe-

<sup>b</sup> Εἰ τοιουν δια τὸ θεῶν ἀρεσκῆ, τὰ ᾗ ἐλήφασιν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι  
<sup>c</sup> Οἱ γὰρ καὶ περὶ οἰκείων ἡμῶν τημάτων, ὅτι.



nitent ; nor that God hath oblig'd himself to ratify the Absolution of the Church for the Remission of Sins to those, who are qualified for it by Repentance. Neither, I suppose, will he deny, that the Administration of the Holy Eucharist is the ordinary means of conveying the sacerdotal Absolution of Sins after Baptism, as Baptism is the ordinary means of conveying the sacerdotal Absolution of Sins to the Baptized, which they committed before Baptism. Nor will he deny, I take it for granted, that the Priest is the Judge competent, to whom the Sacraments shall be administered, and to whom not, whether the penitent Sinner after Baptism shall be loosed by giving him the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist for the Remission of his Sins, or by a verbal Absolution. Neither can his *Lordship*, I think, deny that as Priests were made, or instituted for the Administration of the Sacraments ; so the Sacraments were instituted to be administered by the Priests, and that to administer them is their proper Right. Nor will he, I presume, make any Difficulty to grant, that as God hath given the Power of the Temporal Sword to Princes, for the Preservation of their Authority, as well as for the Benefit of their People : so he hath given the Power of the Keys, and of administering of the Sacraments to his Priests for the Preservation, and Maintenance of their Authority, as well as for the Benefit of the People. These certainly are *co-ordinate* Ends of the sacerdotal Power ; but which of the two was the principal or primary in God's Intention may perhaps admit of some Dispute, especially if it be consider'd, that God could have given Remission of Sins to true Believers before Baptism, and true Penitents after it, without obliging them to depend upon the sacramental or verbal Absolution of his Priests for the Remission of their Sins, as the ordinary Condition

or Means by which it was to be obtained. For this Reason, I say, it may admit of some little dispute, which of these two co-ordinate Ends is the chief; though I am of the Bishop's Opinion, that the sacerdotal Power, and Sacraments were primarily design'd by God for the Benefit of the People, especially if his Lordship will admit, *that the securing of their Obedience to their Priests by their Dependence upon them is, as certainly it is, much for their Benefit.* And if he will grant this, as one would think he should, then I think there will be very little, if any Difference betwixt his Lordship, and that learned Writer of the Laity, whom he hath taken so much Pains to confute, and expose.

Thus much I thought fit to say by way of Animadversion upon what his Lordship has written<sup>d</sup> upon the *three* principal Opinions, and the zealous Promoters of them in behalf of the Clergy, to advance their Honour and Dignity. And here I leave him to consider of all that I have written for his Sake, as well as my own, who am one of those more especially pointed at in his *Charge*. Only I beg the Liberty of his *Lordship* at parting to beseech him to consider, that if we, in a just Zeal for the Priesthood, had carry'd those three Points a little too high, as for my own part I am satisfied I have not, whether it became a Bishop to make a whole *Charge* against us, to expose us for so venial a Transgression, without any regard to the Time when, and the Place where we wrote, or the just Provocations, which moved us to write. I think had his Lordship consider'd these things, an *Apology* for us would have better become him, than a *Criminal Charge* to the Clergy against us. But besides all these Considerations, there is one more particular, which induced me to write, as I have done, for the Honour and Dignity of the Priesthood of both Orders, and that is the *Gothick Constitution*, wherein

<sup>d</sup> Charge, p. 5.

the secular Honours of the Clergy have occasioned not only the People, but Priests themselves, in a great measure to forget their spiritual Dignity, as Priests. In the *Empire* it is observable, that the dignified Clergy are not only more valued, but also generally value themselves more as Princes, Palatines, and Lords, than as Bishops and Priests; and in other Kingdoms of the *Gothick Constitution*, it may now and then be seen, that as *Paulus Samosatenus* affected the secular Title of *Ducenarius* before that of Bishop, so some Prelates are so dazzled with the Splendor of their Titles, as Nobles of the Realm, it may be Peers; or as in some Kingdoms, as Dukes and Peers, that they think their Dignity greater, as Lords and Judges of Parliament; and value themselves more as such, than as they are Christ's Vicegerents and Bishops, and Senators of the Church. In Kingdoms of such a tempting Constitution, especially in Kingdoms which are sunk into the Dreggs thereof, and where Priests as Priests are growing into contempt, it can never be unseasonable to magnify the Priesthood, and put both Laity, and Clergy in mind of the sacerdotal Dignity, especially from such Monuments of the ancient Church, as shew both what the *Laity*, Emperors and Kings not excepted, thought of Priests in the purest times, and what Priests, who were Saints and Martyrs, or otherwise eminent for the Love of Souls, and the contempt of the World, thought, and wrote of themselves, and of their spiritual Authority as Priests. His Lordship might have also consider'd, that we, whom he is pleas'd to mark out, and distinguish from other Writers by a particular *Characteristick*, as Promoters of the *three Opinions* which, he saith, *have lately been revived*, have not been revived by us for any worldly End, or Interest; but purely for the Love of Truth, and to promote both the temporal and e-

## I. *An ACCOUNT of, &c.*

ternal Happiness of the People, as well as the Honour of the Priests. We are not in the Interests of the World, which hath deprived us; but as the generality of the World in this Iron-Age hath been for many Years, it had been much more for our worldly Ease, and Interest to have lower'd the Priesthood in our Writings, to have nailed the Ears of the Church in them to the Door posts of the State, to have flatter'd the *Empire* into an absolute spiritual Supremacy over the *Church*; to have opposed the proper Priesthood of the Clergy, to have writ them down into a Stipendiary Ministry, or to have publish'd Books of sceptical Subjects, which gratify the Animal Life, and are highly grateful to Flesh and Blood. Had we written as the Men of *Latitude* do, and employ'd our Pens as free Thinkers, to rescue the enslav'd World from the Craft, and Tyranny of her Priests, we had been the Favourites of all the Enemies of the Church, and her Clergy; but without any worldly view, or design to please Men, we have written for Truth, for sober, primitive, Catholick Truths in behalf of both; for Truths, of which even the Bishop, and those of his Clergy, who desired him to print his Charge against us, we hope may by God's Blessing upon our Books, find the Benefit, tho' we can reap no other Benefit by them, than to have the satisfaction of seeing the Doctrines his *Lordship* saith we have *reviv'd*, revive, the Veneration, which the People ought to have for their Priests, and the Value, and Reverence, which their Priests ought to have for themselves, as the Ministers of God.

*The Ordering of Priests.*— You have heard, Brethren, of what Dignity, and of how great Importance this Office is, wheteunto you are call'd, and now again we exhort you in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you have in remembrance into how high a Dignity, and to how weighty an Office and Charge you are call'd. — Forasmuch then as your Office is of so great Excellency, and of so great Difficulty — that you may shew your selves dutiful, and thankful unto that Lord, who hath plac'd you in so high a Dignity.



# CONTENTS

## Of the PREFATORY DISCOURSE in Answer to The Rights, &c.

### Introduction.

**A**N Account of the Author's  
Conference with a Lady  
who had been of the Church of  
Rome, concerning the Nature  
of the Christian Church, p. 1  
How the Substance of the said Con-  
ference was at her desire drawn  
up into Propositions, p. 3  
Two Objections afterward started  
against these Propositions; the  
one by a Lawyer, the other by a  
Divine, p. 4  
The Occasion of the Author's writ-  
ing his Discourse of the Dignity  
of the Episcopal Order, *ibid.*  
The Occasion of his writing that  
of the Christian Priesthood asser-  
ted, *ibid.*  
The PROPOSITIONS with Notes  
upon them, p. 5  
Prop. I. Of the Church as a Soci-  
ety by Divine Right, *ibid.*  
Whence call'd Christ's Body,  
*ibid.* marg.  
II. Of the Government and Gover-  
nors of this Society, p. 6  
Whence call'd God's Household,  
&c. *ibid.* marg.  
III. Of the Episcopal Dignity and  
Jurisdiction, p. 6, 7  
That the Bishops are the Apostles  
Successors, by unexceptionable  
Witnesses clear'd, *ibid.* marg.  
IV. Of the Christian Priesthood  
and Ministry, p. 8  
That Christian Priests are Christ's  
Representatives and Vicars,  
*ibid.* marg.

The Occasion of publishing those  
Two Discourses which these  
Propositions gave birth to, p. 8

General Reflections upon the  
Method lately taken of attacking  
the true Rights of the Christian  
Church, as laid down in the Pro-  
positions.

Nothing so needful to the Under-  
standing of the Controversy be-  
tween us and the Church of  
Rome, as a right and compleat  
Notion of the Church, as a  
Spiritual Society, p. 2, &c.

The insolent manner of attacking  
the Constitution of the Christian  
Church and Priesthood by the  
Book falsly entitl'd, The Rights  
of the Christian Church, p. 8

That Author's disingenuous way of  
Arguing against Facts of publick  
Notoriety, p. 9

His fallacious Reasonings; and  
from whom stolen, *ibid.*

His pretended Discovery no better  
than a blasphemous Charge a-  
gainst God himself the Founder  
of his Church, p. 10

The very same Objections would  
serve as well against the Con-  
stitution of the Jewish Church,  
p. 11

Or even against the Natural Con-  
stitution of Man, as he is subject  
to two different Powers. *ibid.*

The Madness, as we llas Profaneness  
of this way of writing, p. 12

The Vanity of all such modern  
Books, when compar'd with  
Scriptu

## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

- Scripture and Primitive Anti-*  
*quity.* ibid.
- The Influence of our modern Free-*  
*Thinkers, Deists and Atheists,*  
*observed,* p. 13
- An Account of the Table-Talk of*  
*some Free-thinkers, among whom*  
*was the reputed Author of The*  
*Rights, &c. concerning Revela-*  
*tion,* p. 14
- Another Account of a Conversation*  
*of some of these not unlike to the*  
*former, chiefly concerning Mi-*  
*racles,* p. 15
- Some Reflections upon the Wit and*  
*Humour of these Men, inbring-*  
*ing the Holy Scriptures to their*  
*Test of Ridicule,* p. 17
- Their Conspiracy against Christ and*  
*his Church detected, and their*  
*own Principles retorted upon*  
*themselves,* p. 18
- Their Grounds for reviling the Or-*  
*der of Priests,* p. 19
- Christ himself involv'd in their*  
*Charge of Priestcraft and Leger*  
*de main,* ibid.
- The astonishing Liberty of these*  
*Men,* p. 20. See marg.
- An Account of one of them that re-*  
*solv'd all Religion into Dream-*  
*ing, with a Passage out of*  
*Festus Pompeius,* ibid.
- An Account of a scandalously blas-*  
*phemous Paper design'd to pro-*  
*felyste a certain Lady from be-*  
*lieving in Christ, left by two of*  
*them at her House,* p. 21
- The Modesty of Julian the Apostate*  
*compar'd with these Apostates*  
*ibid.* p. 77, 80
- Julian a Man of Principles,* ibid.
- And an Honour of the Office of a*  
*Priest in all Religions,* p. 22
- His testimony for the distinction and*  
*independency of the Sacerdotal*  
*from the Secular Power,* ibid.
- His acting accordingly in different*  
*Capacities, as an Emperor,*  
*and as a Priest,* p. 23
- The concurrent Testimony of all*  
*Mankind in the common Notion*  
*of the Priesthood, and of the*  
*Difference betwixt the Sacred*  
*and Civil Power, no less than*  
*in that of a Deity and of Di-*  
*vine Worship,* p. 25
- The Author of The Rights might*  
*hence as well charge the Notion*  
*of God, the Mediation of*  
*Christ, The Belief of the World*  
*to come, &c. to be borrow'd*  
*from the Heathens, as this of*  
*the Priesthood,* ibid.
- His Calumnies reflect not only on*  
*the Christian Priesthood, but*  
*also on the Jewish and Patri-*  
*archal; and even on Melchise-*  
*deck,* p. 26
- A fair Proposal to the Temporal*  
*Government,* p. 27
- The Prejudices of some  
Churchmen against certain Do-  
ctrines here delivered, candidly  
consider'd.
- The true Reason why even some of*  
*the Clergy are such Strangers*  
*to some Things advanc'd in the*  
*Two Treatises,* p. 27
- Which are farther vindicated from*  
*the dangerous Affe'ation of Sin-*  
*gularity by the united Testimony*  
*of the best Ancient Christian*  
*Writers,* p. 28
1. *St. Gregory Nazianzen,* ibid.
  2. *St. Gregory Nycen.* p. 32
  3. *Eusebius.* p. 41
  4. *St. Chrysostom,* p. 46  
and 47 in marg. 77
  5. *St. Hierom,* p. 45
  6. *St. Augustin,* p. 48
  7. *St. Cyprian, and the Cypria-*  
*nick Age,* p. 32, &c.
  8. *The*

# CONTENTS

8. *The Synodical Determination of the African Bishops in the Case of Basilidis and Marialis,*

p. 35, 37

9. *The Apostolical Constitutions,*

p. 40 in marg.

10. *St. Clemens Romanus,* p. 36

*A Passage of Bishop Wake's Translation rectify'd by the Margin,*

ibid.

*Modern Testimonies added.*

1. *Dr. Brevint,* p. 37

2. *Bishop Taylor,* p. 38

3. *The present Bishop of Sarum,*

p. 39

4. *Bishop Andrews,* p. 40

5. *Dr. Heylin,* p. 41

6. *Bishop Stillingfleet,* p. 44

7. *An interleav'd Book of Common Prayer, by a Friend of Bishop Overall,*

p. 45, 51

*Some Reflections and Observations upon it,*

p. 46, 47, 51

*An Answer to the foul Imputation of Priestcraft, and Heathenish Mystery.*

*The Book of The Rights for this and misrepresents the Lord's Supper, and ridicules the Notion of Consecration,*

p. 52

*That charges Heathenish Knavery on all the Primitive Fathers of the Church,*

p. 53

*Nay it involves even St. Paul himself,*

p. 54

*Sacrificial Entertainments common to all Religions,*

ibid.

*The Absurdity of branding every thing for Heathenish that is own'd in the Religion both of*

*Heathens, Jews and Christians,*

p. 55

*Why this Writer abstains from the Term of Sacrament, as*

*well as from that of Sacrifice;*

p. 56

*Sacrament the same in the Latin as Mystery in the Greek Church,*

ibid.

*His Master-piece consists in craftily confounding Times and Persons,*

ibid.

*How all the Doctrines of Christianity may be equally expos'd for Priestcraft by the same way of*

*Arguing,*

p. 57, 58

*The general Fallacy which runs through his whole Book,*

p. 57

*The Absurdity and Malice of deriving the Christian Notion of*

*Sacrifice, Priest and Altar, from the Heathens rather than from*

*the Jews,*

p. 58

*Paganism was Judaism corrupted,*

p. 59

*Not unlawful to borrow a proper Term, or a good Custom, from*

*Paganism,*

p. 60

*More Table-talk,*

p. 61

*Gallionism, and Indifference for these things, censur'd,*

p. 61 and 206

*A seasonable and necessary Call to the Clergy, courageously to discharge their Duty in evil Times,*

p. 62 and 95

*The true Catholick Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.*

*How it accidentally grew into Disuse in this Church,*

p. 63

*The Alterations made in the order of administering it from the first*

*Liturgy of the Church of England,*

ibid.

*The order observ'd herein by Bishop Overall,*

p. 64

*The Reason of the restor'd Rubrick for reverently setting the Bread*

*and Wine upon the Altar,*

ibid.

*The Method of anciently placing the Elements first upon the*

*Paratorium or Credence,*

p. 65

\* 2 Some

## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

- Some Remarks hereupon, p. 66  
 Three Reasons given for these Remarks, p. 67  
 A Vindication of Archbishop Laud from Popish Innovation, p. 68  
 The Disingenuity of the Author of The Rights in charging him with what he had been fully clear'd of, p. 70  
 Barely also upon the Testimony of most malicious Enemies, p. 61  
 Several other false Charges against him reviv'd by that Author, after they were Answer'd in the History of his Troubles, p. 71, 72  
 Calumny in perfection, exemplified in two Points, p. 73  
 The Method of wounding the Church through this Archbishop's Side, p. 74  
 Of the Church and Church-Officers.  
 The various Significations of the Word Church consider'd and adjusted, p. 74, 75  
 The opprobrious Names by this Author bestow'd on the Clergy, ammadverted upon, p. 76  
 His reproachful Insults upon the Order of the Christian Priesthood, terminate upon Christ himself and his Apostles, p. 58 and 76  
 The Nobility of this Priesthood further asserted and Vindicated, ibid.  
 Mean Extraction, or even Slavery itself, no Dishonour to the Order, p. 77  
 Priests and Bishops made of Slaves were anciently not the least respected, ibid.  
 The Calumniator is sent again to Julian, to be better instructed, ibid.  
 The wise and just Reflection of St. Chrysostom upon this matter, p. 77, 78  
 The Story of Alexander Carbonarius and Gregorius Thaumaturus, p. 78  
 Of Councils and Ecclesiastical Synods.  
 His invidious and unchristian Charge against all Councils in general consider'd, ibid.  
 His unfair Application of a Saying of Gregory Nazianzen, p. 79  
 Directly contrary to that Father's Intention, who was himself a known Creed-Maker in the Council of C. P. ibid.  
 His Popular Fallacy in Arguing from the Miscarriages of Councils exploded, p. 80  
 His Excellence in a Satyr upon the Nature of Man, ibid.  
 What use a Mahometan would make of this false way of Reasoning, p. 81  
 What pretty use a Sadducee or Theistical Jew might make of it, ibid.  
 How very contrary this to the Conduct of Christ and of his Apostles, p. 82  
 His Ridiculing of Councils and Synods shewn to be a Libel against all Senates, States, Diets and Parliaments, ibid.  
 Mr. Prynne's Opinion of Parliaments offerr'd to his Consideration, p. 83  
 Councils and Parliaments both vindicated against him, p. 84  
 Whether the Canons of the one, or the Statutes of the other are to be look'd on as Impositions, p. 85  
 The further Prospect of this doughty Author laid open, ibid.  
 That



# CONTENTS

*That Heretical Councils may be Diabolically inspir'd,* p. 86  
*That wicked Men may be acted by wicked Spirits, both separately and together; and that some Writers are certainly so,* *ibid.*  
*The first General Council of Nice vindicated against Marvel, and this Author who cites him,* p. 87

*The Pagan Themistius, an Apolo-gist for Christians and Christian Councils, against this Author and his Club,* p. 88

*The Anti-Nicene Venom against Priesthood and Priests, and their Synods, incurable,* *ibid.*

*The Objections would not be a whit less tho' even Angels themselves should be made Priests,* p. 89

*But rather greater,* *ibid.*  
*And consequently no Security from Detraction or from Sophistry,* *ibid.*

*His ridiculous Sophistry about Sac-rilege,* p. 90

*The remaining Revenues of the Church, the main Grievance to him and Men of his Latitude,* p. 91, 120

*The false Turns he has given to Church History, censur'd,* p. 91

*His dishonest Method in Citations observed,* *ibid.*

*Six Sorts of these; all justly ex-cepted against,* *ibid.*

*A notable Citation out of le Clerc against Councils and Creeds re-flected upon,* p. 92

*The Nicene Faith another intole-rable Grievance to them,* p. 93

*This and Non-Resistance provoke them to write against the Cler-gy, with such Bitterness,* *ibid.*

Of Church Censures.

*The Power of the Keys no novel*

*High-Church Doctrine, but the old Doctrine of the Church of England,* p. 93

*Nay as old as Christianity itself,* p. 94

*That this Power is not only Doctri-nal, but Authorative and Mini-sterial, as asserted by the Bishop of Sarum,* *ibid.*

*And as is plain from the Sense and Practice of the Primitive Christians,* *ibid.*

*And by Consequence, that the Sen-tences of Excommunication and Absolution must be not only De-clarative, but Judicial,* p. 95

*As founded upon Christ's Words and Authority,* *ibid.*

*Binding and Loosing by the Ministry of Men, the same as by that of Angels,* *ibid.*

*The Censure of St. Ambrose upon Theodosius the Great, never yet condemn'd by any Church; and expressly approv'd by our own,* p. 95, 96

*The true Grounds of the Contempt of the Clergy,* p. 96

*The Non User and Abuser of this sacred Power hence animadver-ted on,* *ibid.*

*What would be the Consequence of the Restauration of the ancient Discipline of the Church,* p. 97

*The Sophistical way of arguing a-against Ecclesiastical Discipline, from some Corruptions in the Exercise of it,* *ibid.*

*How Clergymen have been them-selves in all Ages the most se-vere in censuring and lamenting these Corruptions,* p. 98

*His Argument from the Male-Ad-ministration of Church Censures, unbings all manner of Govern-ment,* *ibid.*

*And is big of Absurdities,* p. 99  
*That*

## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

*That from the Execution of Justice in capital Cases by the Civil Magistrate no less inconclusive,*

p. 100

*His third and Herculean Argument taken from the Effect attributed to Excommunication, found weak and frivolous,*

p. 101

*The avoiding the Company of Excommunicates, not attended with such Consequences as he objects,*

p. 102

*Is most consonant to the express Directions and Commands of our Lord and his Apostles,*

p. 103

*Doth not discharge any one from the Bonds of natural, domestick or civil Relation,*

p. 104

*The Case of a Magistrate under Excommunication, stated, ibid.*

*His fourth Argument taken from the Excommunicating Persons for trifling Causes, examin'd,*

p. 105

*His fifth, That the Magistrate will not then have all the Power necessary for the Protection of his Subjects, shewn fallacious, ibid.*

*His sixth, From the danger of Imposition in Things indifferent, and of a civil Nature,*

p. 106

*His ordinary Fallacy of arguing against lawful Power, from the Abuse of it, ibid.*

*That the Church hath Power to appoint Holydays; and even to give Orders concerning Apparel,*

p. 107

*His pretended Absurdity a most laudable Apostolical Institution, ibid.*

*An honourable Conformity herewith in a Queen of France, ibid.*

*He begs the Question, p. 108*

*Which is a Practice very familiar with him, ibid.*

*His seventh Argument, that such a Power gives the Clergy Cognizance of all Causes whatsoever, answer'd, p. 109*

*The Church disclaims all Pretence to Secular Jurisdiction, as suggested, ibid.*

*His eighth, That it subjects the same Person to undergo two Trials for the same Crime, enervated, p. 110*

### Of the Power of Ordination and Deprivation.

*The Fallacy of his Argument for Lay-Deprivation (and consequently Lay-Ordination) detected, p. 110, 111*

*The Consequence from putting to Death to Depriving, never own'd by the ancient Christians, p. 113*

*Another Fallacy of his for the Power of Deprivation in the Magistrate, which begs the Question, p. 114*

*A third Fallacy as good as the former, in the Case of Imprisonment or Banishment, ibid.*

*His loose way of disputing against the Power of Ordination in the Church, p. 115*

*The pretended Inconsistency of it with the Magistrates Power to protect the Common-wealth, precarious and absurd, ibid.*

*He wounds himself by it, and betrays his own Cause, p. 116*

*Also the pretended Impossibility of such a Power, with the Magistrates Obligation to protect the Church, disprov'd, ibid.*

*Several Fallacies and Falsities more detected, p. 117, &c.*

# CONTENTS

*How the Tables may be easily  
turn'd upon him,* p. 119  
*The Folly and Blasphemy of his  
Horeb Contraſt,* p. 120  
*The wild Notion of his State of  
Nature,* ibid.  
*His whole Scheme overturn'd by  
the Biſhop of Sarum,* ibid.

## Of Church Revenues.

*The Revenues of the Clergy a main  
Eye-ſore to him,* ibid.  
*His Impeachment hence of the Di-  
vine Wiſdom for annexing ſuch  
large Profits, and Privileges  
too, on the Jewish Prieſthood;*  
p. 120, 150  
*An Obſervation out of Philo Ju-  
deus, whoſe Traſt concerning  
the Rewards and Honours of  
the Prieſthood, is recommen-  
ded to this Author,* p. 121

## The new Scheme.

*His new Scheme of Religion ut-  
terly deſtructive of Chriſtianity,*  
p. 122  
*It is erected on many Abſurdities  
on falſe Suppoſitions,* p. 123  
*He proves himſelf a Creed-Maker,  
and falls under his own Condem-  
nation,* ibid.  
*His Creed impartially conſider'd;  
and his Perſecuting Spirit ſet  
hereupon in a due Light,* p. 124  
*How eaſily a Freer-Thinker than  
himſelf may retort back upon  
him all his own Reaſons,*  
p. 125  
*He catches himſelf in a Nooſe,  
and plainly ſhews himſelf an  
Enemy to the Toleration,* ibid.  
*And a Betrayer of the Subjects  
Liberty,* p. 126  
*His Method for preventing of Prieſt-  
craft, nothing elſe but mere  
Threatening the Clergy,* p. 127

*His moſt formidable Hereafter-  
Book challeng'd,* p. 120, 127

*The Diſtinction between the Em-  
pire and the Church, ſtated.*

*This Author's Method for preven-  
ting of what he calls Eccleſi-  
aſtical Tyranny, no more than  
a Scare-Crow,* p. 127

*The Heroick Answer of Catholick  
Biſhops to an Arian Emperour,  
pursuing this Method,* ibid.

*His confounding of the Prieſthood  
and Magiſtracy together, ſtrikes  
even at Moſes,* p. 128

*Tea at Chriſt himſelf,* ibid.

*The Diſtinction of Clergy and Lai-  
ty, how old,* ibid.

*The Difference of the two Powers  
certainly as old as the Union of  
the Church and Empire,* ibid.

*Recogniz'd by the greateſt Chriſti-  
an Emperors,* ibid.

*The Declaration hereupon of the  
Emperor Baſilius,* p. 129

*The Independency of theſe  
two Powers on each other, far-  
ther prov'd,*

1. *By the Difference of their Ori-  
ginals,* ibid.

2. *By their different Extents,*  
p. 130, &c.

3. *By the different Ways by which  
Men are admitted into them,*  
ibid.

4. *By their different Rights and  
Privileges,* ibid.

5. *By the Diversity of their Ends  
and Objects, &c.* p. 133

*A ſcurrilous and blaſphemous Com-  
pariſon refleſted upon,* p. 130

*More Sophiſtry expos'd,* p. 131

*The Rights of Naturalization and  
Baptiſm moſt different,* p. 132

*The noble Speech of Valentian I.  
before and after the Election*

## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

- of St. Ambrose to the Bishop-  
rick of Milan, p. 133
- The Respect anciently paid from  
Emperours to Bishops; and the  
Case of the Tyrant Maximus  
being refus'd by St. Ambrose,  
p. 134
- This Author in his Rage against  
the Church, flatly contradicts  
his own Principles, ibid.
- He argues down all Government  
in the State that is not pure-  
ly Absolute and Despotical,  
p. 135
- He puts Weapons into the Hands of  
the Church and Court of Rome,  
ibid.
- And of four New Societies also  
near Home, p. 136
- While he pleads against one Inde-  
pendency, he sets up himself ma-  
ny Independencies, ibid.
- His several independent Powers in  
Religion, full as absurd and in-  
consistent with the Civil Power,  
as he even pretends the Church  
Power to be, p.
- Nay more so; and are calculated  
for turning Kingdoms into Con-  
fusion and Blood, p. 137
- By his Principles any Heretical  
Sect whatsoever may and ought  
to rise against the Prince or  
State, in Defence of their He-  
resy, ibid.
- The Case of the Docetes, or other  
impute Gnosticks, put, ibid.
- The Church claims not by Divine  
Right a greater Independency on  
the State, than he by Natural  
Right allows every Society but  
pretending to be a Church,  
p. 138
- This instanced in the Power of  
1. Legislation, ibid.
2. Jurisdiction, p. 139
- All religious Fraternities censure  
their own disorderly Members  
independently on the Magistrate,  
ibid.
- The Fallacy of excluding the Nati-  
onal Church alone from this  
common Right, p. 140
- For the Exercise. but whereof our  
Clergy are nick-nam'd Christian  
Druids, ibid.
- But the Quakers for exerting this  
Independency in a far higher  
manner than they, are help'd out  
by his new Scheme, ibid.
- This Author gives them and all  
the Seditaries another String to  
their Bow, p. 141
- He betrays the Royal Supremacy,  
which he would seem to defend,  
ibid.
- If the Church of England would  
but embrace his Principle of  
Natural Right, 25 H. 8. c. 19.  
would be no Hindrance to her  
claiming the Benefit of this,  
ibid.
- What he pulls down with one Hand,  
he builds up with another,  
p. 142
- What the Magistrate may expect  
to gain by the Change of the Old  
for the New Claim of Ecclesia-  
stical Power, ibid.
- Of the Original of Government.  
His fraudulent way of Arguing  
from the State of Nature, p. 114
1. Contrary to the History of the  
Creation, ibid.
2. And to the common Sense of  
Mankind, ibid.
- His Scheme of Government shewn  
to be wholly precarious and ab-  
surd, p. 144
- Reflects upon God's Wisdom,  
p. 145
- Is subversive of the very Founda-  
tions of all Governments, ibid.
- God's



## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

*God's Institution of Government vindicated from his Calumnies,*  
p. 146

*His Sovereign and Subject fairly expos'd in Trincolo and Stephano,*  
p. 147

*How Kings may in different respects be mutually Subjects and Sovereigns,*  
ibid.

*Several Instances of Persons in different Capacities thus superior and inferior to one another,*  
p. 148

*He insults the Clergy with the Power in the Magistrate of depriving them,*  
p. 149

*His Arguments for that Power a flat Contradiction to his own Scheme,*  
p.

*His great Kindness for the Church Revenues,*  
p. 150

*The Hypocritical Mockery of Harry Martin,*  
ibid.

*The Case of the Church and Clergy of England.*

*The Church of England would be very thankful to the State for the same Privileges which the Kirk of Scotland, so much applauded by this Author, enjoys by Act of Parliament,*  
p. 151

*He licks up the Spittle of a scandalous Pamphlet, entituled, The Principles of the Protestant Religion explain'd in a Letter of Resolution, &c.*  
p. 152

*His fraudulent Practice in using Arguments after and out of other Books already confuted, without taking any notice of the Answers,*  
ibid.

*His manifest Sophistry in confounding what a Man may Naturally with what he can Lawfully do,*  
p. 153

*His notorious Falsity in maintaining the Primitive Christians to have done any social Act by virtue of a Natural Right, laid open,*  
ibid.

*His Hypothesis of an unalienable Natural Right, the most precarious Whim that can be,*  
ibid.

*He has said nothing against Con vocations, but will serve equally against Parliaments,*  
p. 154

*Allowance to be made for human Infirmities in all,*  
ibid.

*A debate between two Gentlemen, the one an Enemy, the other a Friend to the Clergy,*  
p. 155

*His most invidious and fallacious way of speaking of them, animadverted upon,*  
p. 156

*He has no Argument against the Ecclesiastical, but will hold as well against the Regal Power,*  
ibid.

*Why he ridicules the Priests Claim of being God's Ambassadors to the People,*  
p. 157

*Objections against their Mission, Answer'd,*

*The first Objection, from the want of miraculous Credentials, consider'd,*  
p. 157

1. *Such Credentials not likely to have been of any force with such as him,*  
ibid.

2. *They might be as well requir'd for Doctrines, as for Mission,*  
p. 158

3. *The Jewish Priests under the second Temple had them not,*  
p. 159

4. *They were given at first indifferently to all Believers,*  
p. 160

*He and his Club may demand them now of the Laity, as well as of the Clergy,*  
ibid.

# CONTENTS

*His second Objection, from the want of a new Gospel, to discover, frivolous,* p. 161

*Bishop Stillingfleet's excellent Answer hereupon, ibid. in marg.*

## Fraudulent Citations.

*His Citation out of Eutyechius unanswerably refuted by Abraham Echellensis, Morinus, Dr. Hammond, and Bishop Pearson,*

p. 161, 162

*His most disingenuous way in citing a Statute of H. 8. detected,*

p. 163

*Several Artifices and Falsities in his Representation of the Submission of the Clergy, ibid.*

*His plain Misrepresentation of the Recognition of the King's Supremacy in 26 H. 8. c. 1. p. 164*

*Whereupon he is referr'd to the Bishop of Sarum for an Answer to that part of his Preface which relates to the Law, p. 165 Particularly,*

1. *As to the Submission of the Clergy, and the Extent of the Royal Supremacy, p. 165, 170*

2. *As to the Lay-Deprivations, p. 170, 171*

*His false Citation of Tertullian, flatly contradicting his Sense,*

p. 171

*His Fraud in citing Bishop Bull,*

p. 172

*His want of Ingenuity in treating this Champion of the Nicene Faith, farther expos'd, p. 174*

*His evil Genius appears, p. 175*

*His unfair Practice of quoting Books and Passages, fully Answer'd,*

1. *Against Archbishop Laud.*
2. *Against the Canon of Scripture.*
3. *His Story of the Culdees.*
4. *A Passage out of Tert. de Cast.*

5. *Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicum censur'd by himself.*

*This Bishop his own best Apologist, by other Treatises written afterward,* p. 176

*Four Points wherein he is contrary to this Author,* p. 177

That the Church is not a private voluntary, but a publick Society of Christ's Institution.

*His Argument taken from the Law for the Church's being only a Private Society, an errant Fourberie,* p. 178

*Four Arguments for his one,* p. 179

*The Fallacy of his formidable IF's,* p. 180

*And of his Double Entendre,* p. 181

*A plain Case put, which quite overturns his whole Hypothesis,* p. 179, &c.

*His wresting the Laws of the Land, a miserable Shift,*

p. 182

*That Bishops in consecrating act not ministerially by virtue of the Royal Authority, ibid. &c.*

*The Vanity of his Argument against the original Power of Bishops to consecrate others,*

p. 183

*His saucy manner of treating the Civil Magistrate,* ibid.

*His own Argument retorted upon himself,* p. 184

*His sly Pretence of defending the Church of England,* ibid.

*His most rare Knack at wheedling the Clergy,* p. 185

*Some notable Instances more of his fallacious Citing Authors to serve his own Turn, viz.*

1. *My Lord Clarendon against Cressly,* ibid.

2. *Dr. Bar-*

## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

2. Dr. Barrow of the Pope's Supremacy, p. 186
3. Gomarus and Gualterus about the same, p. 188
4. Dr. Scor's Christian Life, *ibid.*
- The true independent Power of the Church vastly different from the false Independent Power of the Pope, p. 187
- The Security of the Prince and State how hereby best provided for, *ibid.*
- His Dishonesty and Malice in joining with Papists, the greatest Enemies to Popery, p. 188
- His Method of Writing admirably calculated for
1. A Treatise against Christianity, by a Veteran Atheist, *ibid.*
2. A Treatise against the Profession of the Law, p. 189
3. Another against Monarchy, and the Civil Magistrate, *ibid.*
- His Inconsistency in stretching the Prince's Supremacy in Spirituals, whom he makes a Servant to the People in Temporals, *ibid.*
- His Civil Demogorgon and Polyphemus reflected on, p. 190
- The pernicious Consequences of his subjecting the Prince to the last Resort of the People, *ibid.*
- His dishonest way of quoting Acts of Parliament farther exemplified, p. 191
- That the Clergy derive not their Power of inflicting Spiritual Censures from the State, *ib.* &c.
- How far the Sentence of the Spiritual Judge ought to respect the Secular Magistrate, p. 193, 194
- His Mobbish Arguments against the Office and Order of Priesthood, confuted by his own very
- Concessions, p. 194, &c.
- He is more free in his Allowance to the People, than to God himself, p. 196
- How a Question of Fact is to be determin'd, *ibid.*
- The Difference betwixt what any Man can do, and what he can do in a Sacerdotal Ministerial Manner, stated, p. 197
- His arguing against the Christian Priesthood, the same with that of Corah, p. 198
- And is of as much force against all Orders of Men in the State, as well as in the Church, *ibid.*
- A Limitation of his, by which he confutes his own Argument, p. 199
- How good he is at contradicting himself, *ibid.*
- His most prophane applying of the Term Conjurat[i]on, *ibid.*
- His ridiculing of the Consecration of Bishops, and Ordination of Priests, vile and blasphemous, p. 200
- Baptism as well as Ordination by his Sarcasms, made to be a Solemn Mockery, p. 201
- His Artifice to wound the Church of England through the Sides of the Popish Clergy, *ibid.*
- His Ironical Vindication of our Clergy, p. 202
- No such Office in the Church of England for the Election of Bishops, as he mentions, ever before heard of, *ibid.*
- His Scurrility and Blasphemy unadverted upon, p. 203
- His mocking at the Clergy as if they made God their Executioner, and put themselves in His place, *ibid.*
- His Heathenish Liberty in speaking of the several Persons of the

# CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><i>the Blessed Trinity,</i> p. 204</p> <p><i>A Passage of his concerning Heathenish Inspiration apply'd home,</i> p. 205.</p> <p><i>Of the Divine Institution of Bishops.</i></p> <p><i>His first Herculean Argument against it an old Popular Fallacy,</i> p. 206</p> <p><i>His second, False in Fact: and if True, proves so much as it plainly proves nothing at all,</i> p. 208</p> <p><i>His third, most invidious and absurd: and impeaches the Divine Goodness as well as Wisdom,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>His fourth no better than mere Clamor, and that many times answer'd,</i> p. 209</p> <p><i>That no strict Doctrines are to be rejected for the Severity of their Consequences,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>That this Doctrine in particular, Unchurches none; but that they Unchurch themselves, who throw off a Government of God's Institution,</i> p. 210</p> <p><i>Who they are that weaken most the Protestant Cause, and widen the Distance among Protestants,</i> p. 211</p> <p><i>The Plea of Necessity consider'd,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>A most serious and compassionate Exhortation to the Protestant Churches abroad, to perfect their Reformation upon Catholick Principles,</i> p. 212, 217</p> <p><i>A noble Passage of St. Ignatius to the Christians of Smyrna,</i> p. 213</p> <p><i>Principles may easily be broken, but cannot be bent,</i> p. 214, 207</p> <p><i>Tenderness for all the Reform'd Churches, and particularly for</i></p> | <p><i>the French, testified,</i> p. 215, &amp;c.</p> <p><i>An Appeal to what the Author has Preach'd and Printed for them,</i> p. 217</p> <p><i>The ill Design herein of this Writer upon them discover'd; and his main Objection answer'd,</i> p. 216, &amp;c.</p> <p><i>The Principles upon which the Church of England Reform'd not to be violated,</i> p. 217</p> <p><i>Whether they that wilfully abdicate Episcopacy, and plead it their Duty so to do, deserve the Name of a Church,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>A Prayer for those that are in such a State,</i> p. 218</p> <p><i>That he may but load a Catholick Principle with Invektives, he even contradicts the Foundation of his whole Work,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>His charging this Principle (1) As destructive to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, examin'd,</i> p. 219</p> <p><i>(2) As not favourable to the Revolution, consider'd,</i> p. 220</p> <p><i>His own Opinion full as destructive to the Scottish Presbyterian Church, as this can be,</i> p.</p> <p><i>By his way of Reasoning, the Presbyterians, both English and Scotch, must have no favourable Opinion of the Revolution,</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Some Figures of his Rhetorick reflected upon,</i> p. 220, &amp;c.</p> <p><i>Of an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the Catholick Church.</i></p> <p><i>The Church of Rome, in what Sense a true Church, and in what not,</i> p. 221</p> <p><i>The Objection against our deriving Succession from the said Church, answer'd.</i> p. 222</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|



## Of the Prefatory Discourse, &c.

- And this Answer never yet reply'd to, p. 223
- The weak Apology of the French Ministers, when press'd by the Papists to shew their Mission, *ibid.*
- The Reason why the Lord Chancellor Clarendon never would communicate with the French Protestants, *ibid.*
- A Citation out of that Noble Historian by this Writer, impertinent to his Purpose. p. 224
- For which he is referr'd to another that is more pertinent. *ibid.*
- How Bp. Morley and others refus'd Communion with them on the same Account. *ibid.*
- Three Reasons for declining an Answer to what he has transcrib'd out of the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the xxiii<sup>d</sup> Article, p. 224, 225
- Some Queries humbly offer'd to his Lordship's serious Consideration on that Subject, p. 225, - 230
- His Lordships Character of Episcopacy recommended, p. 229
- The Interests of Popery how, and by whom best served, p. 230
- Of the Unity and Original Rights of the Catholick Church.
- His Fallacy in confounding the Notion of the Unity of the Catholick Church, by comparing National Churches with the Government of Independent Kingdoms, p. 231
- Why Christians all the World over make but One Body Politick in Ecclesiasticks p. 232, &c.
- His first Argument against this answer'd, p. 234.
- His second Argument examin'd, *ib.*
- Comparisons to set forth the Unity hereof according to the Reasonings of the N. Testament, p. 235
- His mad Attempt to have many independent Churches of Natural Right, instead of one Holy Catholick Church of Divine Right, p. 236
- The Prejudices and Objections against this Principle of Unity in the Church of England consider'd, *ibid.*
- His ridiculous Essay to batter down Church-Unity, and Episcopal Ordination. by Act of Parliament, *ibid.*
- His repeated Attack against Episcopal Consecrations, p. 237
- He makes very strange Work with Premunire. *ibid.*
- Some other Queries put hereupon to him to answer, p. 238
- His Crambe-Objection dismiss'd, with three notable Interrogations for him to chew upon, *ib.*
- His Art of Smuggling what makes against him, p. 239
- An Assertion of his against Reason and Fact, p. 240
- Authorities of Lawyers and Records to prove that our Kings have sat and administred Justice in their Courts of Judicature, p. 240, &c. 253
- Another Bundle of Queries for him to answer, upon his Scheme of Consecration deriv'd solely from the Crown, p. 242
- His Argument from Penal Restraints most trifling and false, *ibid.* p. 243
- An Answer to his Objections from the Act of Submission, in the Words of the Bp. of Lincoln, And of Dr. Kennet, p. 245
- All his Arguments against Church Government Sophistical, and plainly against Fact, p. 246
- A judicious Observation of Spalatenfis, p. 246, Marg. Some

# C O N T E N T S

- Some Authors referr'd to for full Satisfaction herein, p. 247, and in marg.
- His Fanatical Objection of a Popedom being unavoidable from the Episcopal Constitution of Church-Government exploded,* p. 247, &c.
- His extravagant way of Arguing, in contradiction to plain Fact, and consistent Testimony of Churches,* ibid.
- His Calumny upon the English Clergy for carrying the Power of the Church as high as the Papists, reflected on,* p. 248
- His notorious Misapplication of Authors to serve a Turn,* ibid.
- How he perverts the Words of Mr. Chillingworth,* ibid.
- Reflexions upon a Saying of K. Charles II. cited by him; and upon another of One whom he calls a Reverend Divine,* ibid. 249
- His Challenge accepted,* p. 249
- His seeking Protection from the Laity reflected on,* p. 250
- A strange Paradox and Riddle from him,* p. 251
- Some of his Contradictions taken notice of,* ibid.
- His scurrilous Language given the Clergy,* p. 252
- His fallacious Representation of the Spiritual Power as the Occasion of all Mischiefs to Mankind,* ibid.
- Nothing so Good, but it may be the Accidental Cause of Evil,* p. 253
- His Objection from the Parliaments authorizing 32 Persons to establish Ecclesiastical Laws, Answer'd by Dr. Fuller and Dr. Atterbury,* p. 254
- His Objection of a Parliamentary Religion whence borrow'd, ibid. His Popish Design detected,* p. 248, 254
- His pretty Artifice in bringing the Arguments of the Church of Rome against the Church of England, p. 230, 248, 254, &c. His Republican Design manifested,* p. 179, 255
- His Notion of Natural Freedom contrary to the Law of Nations which introduced Slavery; and to the Scriptures.* p. 255
- Observations and Reflections upon the whole.
- General Reflections upon the Method, Originals, and Scope of this Master-piece of Anti-Christian Heresy, p. 256
- The Author's Satisfaction and Comfort in the many Lies and Libels upon him by Infidels, p. 257
- His Apologetick for what he has written about the Antient Order of the Communion Office,* p. 258
- And for the Observation of the Restor'd Rubrick; and the Use also of the Paratorium,* p. 259
- A Word in Season to Dr. Hancock, and to Some besides,* p. 260, 261.
- His humble and serious Address to the Clergy,* p. 262
- His Design of a Paranesis to the Candidates of the Priesthood,* p. 212, 213
- A Reflection made upon the Author for Crying out of the Times, fairly consider'd,* p. 264, &c.
- An Appeal to, and Vindication of, the Primitive Fathers, with the Holy Prophets also and Apostles, upon this Charge,* p. 268
- What it is that some think fit to call*

Of the *Prefatory Discourse*, &c.

call Blackening the Times,  
ibid.

*The Attempts of Atheists and  
Deists not altogether so despica-  
ble as pretended,* p. 269

*Critical and Miscellaneous Remarks interspersed.* 1. *Terms of Exception not always taken in an Exclusive, but sometimes in a Comparative Sense*, p. 29, 30. in marg. 2. *The proper Difference of Hostia and Victimæ*; and 3. *The Distinction of the Eucharistical Oblation before and after the Consecration, in St. Cyprian*, p. 34. marg. 4. *The Difference of Ara and Altare*, p. 35 and 59 marg. 5. *Of Quæritæ nequæ and Bæni*, p. 58, 59 marg. 6. *Different Senses of Propitiation and Propitiatory*, p. 46. marg. 7. *And of Sacraments*, p. 47. marg. 8. *Πεθεσις*, p. 65. marg. 9. *Credenza*, p. 66. and in marg. 10. *Πεσοποιε* for the *H. Communion*, p. 264. 11. *The iseg. Σειρρα of the Gods in Pollux*, p. 54. marg. 12. *Excommunication errante clave*, p. 119, marg. 13. *Mysteries of Mithra*, p. 55, &c. 14. *Parliaments*, p. 84. marg.

*Occasional Remarks upon the Growth of Deism, &c. The Arguments of Hobbes, Selden, Spinoza and Marvel against the True Rights of the Church, where answer'd, p. 9. marg. and 11.*

marg. And by whom lick'd up again, p. 9, 256. Some late Books censur'd that strike at the very Root of Christianity, p. 20, 152. marg. Where to find an Antidote against them, p. 256 and 263. Mr. Le Clerc. p. 92. marg. Mr. Ob. Walker, p. 165. Dr. Hancock, p. 29. marg. Bishop Trimmel, p. 264, 269. The Christian Priesthood constantly suppos'd by the B. of Ordination, and by the Liturgy and Rubricks of the Church of England, p. 44. That Spiritual Governors must deliver their own Souls, p. 267. The most proper Course in evil Times.

ibid.

*Honourable mention made of Dr. Atterbury, p. 163. m. 246, 254. Bishop Barlow, p. 186 Bishop Beveridge, p. 263. Bishop Bilson, p. 206. Bishop Bull, p. 65, 263. Bishop Fox of Hereford, p. 97. m. Dr. Grabe, p. 65, &c. Dr. Hammond, p. 263. Mr. Nelson, p. 256. Bishop Parker, p. 17, 187. m. Bishop Pearson, p. 263 Bishop Stillingfleet, p. 160. m. Bishop Wake, p. 244. m. Sir George Wheeler, p. 65. m. A notable Passage of Livy upon the Times, p. 268. m. The Author's Conclusion and Address to the Bishops and Clergy in the Words of Hugo Floriacensis. p. 269*

CON-

# CONTENTS

# CONTENTS

## OF THE

## Christian Priesthood Asserted.

### CHAP. I.

The Grand Objection against the Christian Priesthood, from the Silence of the New Testament, consider'd.

- §. I. **T**HE Occasion of writing this Treatise, p. 1  
 The Objection against the Christian Priesthood propos'd, ibid.  
 Which is taken from Chemnitius, p. 2. But originally started by the Annotators on the Geneva Bible, p. 222, 231  
 And promoted by some late Writers amongst us, with a particular View, ibid.  
 The manner of their Conduct in joining with these, to degrade, the Priesthood, Censur'd, p. 2, 3, 224  
 Their Mistake of the current Doctrine of that Church for which they pretend to be Advocates, p. 2, &c.  
 The Author of the Regal Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Affairs Asserted reflects upon our first Reformers, as well as upon the Antient Fathers, ibid. Vide Marg. and p. 91.  
 The Advantage which he takes from a Passage of Dr. Outram, consider'd, p. 3  
 The Character of Dr. Outram; and the Weight of his single Authority, p. 3, 4  
 A proper Caveat to all Writers in Characterizing the Authors whom they cite, p. 4  
 The Modesty of Grotius in speaking of this Subject, ibid.  
 The Author's chief Design both in his Propositions and in his Letter of the Dignity of the Episcopal Office, p. 5  
 They that deny Bishops and Presbyters to be Priests, do yet carry the Spiritual Authority of the Presbyters as high as he doth that of the Bishops, ibid.  
 The Author's Profession what he will herein stand by, ibid.  
 §. II. The Method by him taken to clear this Objection.  
 The Parts of his Design premis'd, p. 6  
 §. III. (1.) 'Tis no Argument that Bishops and Presbyters are not Priests, because that Name is not given to them in the New Testament.  
 This Argument as good against  
 1. Original Sin, ibid.  
 2. The



## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>2. <i>The Divine Authority of the whole New Testament</i>, p. 7</p> <p>3. <i>Admission of Women to the H. Eucharist</i>.</p> <p>4. <i>Baptism of Infants</i>. And,</p> <p>5. <i>Some common Principles of Christianity</i>.</p> <p><i>That Christian Priests are proper Hierophants and Mystagogues, prov'd against Toland</i>, p. 8</p> <p><i>Both Mysteries, and Stewards of those Mysteries suppos'd in the</i></p> | <p><i>Christian Religion by the New-Testament-Writers; particularly by St. Paul</i>, ibid.</p> <p><i>And testify'd to by St. Ignatius, Tertullian, Sozomen, Nazianzen, &amp;c.</i> p. 8, 9, 10. and in marg.</p> <p><i>St. Paul a Mystagogue of the Gospel</i>, p. 10</p> <p><i>The Difference of the Christian from the Aaronical Priesthood</i>, p. 11</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### C H A P. II.

The positive Proofs for the Christian Priesthood,  
upon the Principles and Reasonings of the New Testament.

- (II.) **T**hat tho' the Names of Priest and Priesthood are not us'd for the Ministers or Ministry of Christ in the New Testament, yet the Things signified by these Names are, and properly do belong to them, p. 12
- §. I. *St. Paul's Description of an High-Priest, or Priest*, p. 12, 13
- §. II. *That Priests are God's Vicegerents in his Church, as Princes are in the State*, p. 13, — 18
- This prov'd by comparing the New with the Old Testament*, ibid. 14, &c.
- Observations on the Signification of the Hebrew Word Cohen*, p. 15, 23
- Another critical Remark to the same purpose, serving to illustrate St. Paul by Moses*, p. 16
- How the Heathens also had the same common Notion of Priests and Priesthood*, p. 17
- The Notion of the Pagan Goths: Hence Gud, Gudin, Gudi, Gudion, &c. transfer'd into the*
- Gothick Gospels*, p. 17, 18
- §. III. *That in the Christian Church Bishops and Presbyters are as properly Priests, as Aaron and his Sons in the Jewish*, p. 18 — 26
- This prov'd from the Nature of their Office, and from the Testimony of Scripture*, p. 19
- Both the Jewish and Gentile Nation of the Priesthood exactly applicable to the Christian Ministry*, p. 20
- A Collection of Terms relating to the Priestly Office, extract'd out of Pollux, Suidas, Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Plutarch, He-sychius, and Phavorinus*, p. 20, 21, 22. and Marg.
- That all these Terms are in strict Propriety no less applicable to the Christian Ministry*, p. 22, &c.
- St. Cyprian's Definition of the Priesthood*, p. 23
- The Dignity of the Priesthood, and Eminence of its Ministry*, ibid. Mini-

# CONTENTS

- Ministers of the Sanctuary, λεῖτουργοί,* p. 24  
*What λεῖτουργία properly is,* p. 25, 38  
*Of Liturgick Acts,* *ibid.*  
*That the Bishops and Presbyters of the Catholick Church are in a true Sense Christian Liturges,* p. 24, 25, &c.  
 §. IV. *Of the several Sorts of Priesthood.*  
*Bloody Sacrifices not at all essential to the Priesthood,* p. 26, 35  
*The Persian Priests, ibid. These compar'd with the Grecian and Roman,* *ibid.* 27  
*Mahometan Priests and Sacrifices,* p. 27, and in marg.  
*The End of all Material Offerings,* p. 27, 28, marg.  
*They are not necessarily ty'd to the Priestly Office,* p. 29  
*Both Bloody and Unbloody Sacrifices constantly suppos'd of an Honorary Nature,* *ibid.*  
*Spiritual Sacrifices of the Mind made by Pagans and Jews as well as Christians, the Chief or Only Sacrifices,* p. 30  
*The Weakness of some in Arguing hence against the Eucharistical Sacrifice,* *ibid* in marg.  
*The Jewish Priests, proper Priests in the Captivity, without Sacrifices and Sacrificial Rites,* p. 31  
*Tho' without a Priest there can be no Sacrificing; yet a Man may without Sacrificing be a Priest,* p. 32  
*Absurdities of the contrary Opinion,* *ibid.* &c.  
 §. V. *A Plea for the Priesthood of the two Superior Orders of Presbyters and Bishops, even from the Share thereof which is communicated to the Inferior*  
*Order of Deacons,* p. 35, 41  
*The Deacon's Office of a Sacerdotal Nature in the Third or lowest Degree,* p. 35  
*A Passage of Optatus Milevitanus hence set in a clear light, ibid.*  
*The Diaconica of Dionysius of Alexandria,* p. 36  
*Some Passages of St. Ignatius for farther Illustration and Confirmation hereof,* *ibid.*  
*Two Sorts of Minist'ring, or Deaconship in all Religions,* p. 37  
*The Office of a Deacon, in what respect Servile,* p. 38, 39  
*And in what respect Sacerdotal,* p. 39  
*Deacons allow'd to receive Confessions and absolve Penitents, in some Cases,* p. 40  
*Not anciently permitted to preach à Cathedra; and why,* p. 41  
*An Argument a fortiori, from the Sacerdotal Acts of Deacons, for the Priesthood in the superior Degrees,* *ibid.*  
 §. VI. *Of the Christian Altar, another Plea for the same upon the Principles of the New Testament,* p. 42, 53  
*That the Ministers of Christ are proper Altar-Ministers,* p. 42  
*Not only Priests, but also Sacrificing Priests,* *ibid.*  
*Gift, a Sacrificial Term, as us'd by Christ himself, ibid. And of a very comprehensive Signification,* in marg.  
*The Precept of Reconciliation, which relates to it, evidently a Gospel-Precept,* p. 43  
*Many other Precepts of Christ given by way of Anticipation for the Gospel-State,* *ibid.*  
*This accordingly so understood of the Eucharistical Oblation, or Sacri-*

## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

Sacrifice, by the Primitive Church, p. 44  
Which appears particularly,

1. By the Apostolical Constitutions, ibid.

The most Primitive Order of the Eucharistical Service, p. 45

2. By Irenæus, p. 46
3. By Tertullian, ibid.

Manus perficere, a Sacrificial Expression to offer the Eucharistical Oblation, p. 47

Of τελεῖν and τελέειν, and Christ's last Word on the Cross, τετέλεσται, Sacrificial Terms, ibid. in marg.

4. By St. Cyprian, p. 48

5. By Eusebius, p. 49

6. By Cyril of Jerusalem, p. 50

The Holy Kiss of Peace founded on this Text.

7. By Chrysostom; ibid.

Several Christian Sacrifices distinguished, p. 51

8. By Hierom, p. 52

9. By Augustin, ibid.

S. VII. This farther confirm'd from the Words of the Institution, p. 53, 68

An ample and plain Proof from the Testimony of St. Cyprian, and of the whole Church of his Time, p. 54, 55

2. Another from the Eucharistical Office in the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 56

3. From St. Irenæus, ibid. p. 57

Dr. Grabe's Catalogue of Testimonies for the Eucharistical Oblation, from the Prophecy in Malachi, ibid. in marg.

The Signification of the Word ποιεῖν and ἱεροποιεῖν, both in Profane and sacred Writers, p. 58, &c.

More than forty Instances in the Septuagint Translation of this

Sacrificial Sense, p. 58, 63

This taken in the same Sense by Ecclesiastical Writers, p. 63

1. By Clemens Romanus, ibid.

2. By Justin Martyr, ibid.

3. By Cornelius Bishop of Rome, p. 64

4. By Chrysostom, p. 65

5. By Irenæus, p. 66

6. By Tertullian, ibid.

Mr. Pool's Mistake corrected, ibid.

7. In the antient Liturgies, p. 66, 67

The proper Determination of the Words of Institution, p. 67

S. VIII. From the Places of the New Testament which imply and express, that the Christian Religion has an Altar, p. 68, 80

- 1 1 Cor. ix. By the consentient Interpretation of Primitive Writers, p. 69

- 2 Mat. v. 23. By the same so apply'd, p. 70

- 3 Heb. xiii. 10. The Exposition of Tenacommended, p. 70 in marg.

The proper Sense hereof vindicated against a late Writer, p. 71

Assisted by

1. The Apostles Argument against the Jews, taken from their own Law, p. 73.

2. The Practice of the Syrian Churches, p.

3. The Testimony of ancient Fathers, p. 74

The Lord's Table, a Name given to the great Altar at Jerusalem, p. 75 and marg.

Altar and Table, the same in different respects, p. 71, 72 in marg. and p. 75, 79

Some farther Critical Observations upon the Use of the Name Altar.

# CONTENTS

The same apply'd to Tables, *ibid.*  
 To certain Rocks in the Medi-  
 terranean Sea, p. 77. And  
 to the Rock of Manoa, *ibid.*  
 The Communion-Table so call'd  
 from the very Time of the A-  
 postles, down to the Reforma-  
 tion, p. 77, &c.  
 Four Times in the Epistles of St.  
 Ignatius, *ibid.*, &c.  
 The Vanity of the Objection against  
 its being an Altar, from its  
 being a Table, p. 79  
 S. IX. The Sacrifice offer'd upon  
 the Christian Altar, p. 80—91  
 This prov'd out of the Writings of  
 the New Testament, *ibid.*  
 [1.] From the Argument of St.  
 Paul, taken from the Feasts of  
 the Heathens upon their Idol-  
 Sacrifices, p. 80, 81  
 The common Notion upon which all  
 Sacrificial Feasts were found-  
 ed, *ibid.* and p. 84, 103  
 Sacrifices eaten at the place  
 where they were offer'd, p. 81.  
*see marg.*  
 The Sacrificial Feast of Cleobis  
 and Biston, p. 82  
 Ἰδολεῖον, Idoleum, *ibid.*  
 The Remark of Drusius and Li-  
 velius upon those Flot-Feasts,  
*ibid.* *marg.*  
 Such Sacrificial Tables in the  
 Temples commonly referr'd to in  
 the Greek and Latin Poets, p. 83  
 The Ceremony us'd at approaching  
 them, p. 84  
 The exact Parallel between the  
 Lord's Table and the Table of  
 Devils, *ibid.*  
 A Paraphrase on 1 Cor. x. 20, 21,  
 p. 85  
 The Jewish and Gentile Notion  
 of Communion with the Deity  
 allow'd by the Apostle, *ibid.*  
 A Parallelism betwixt Altar-

Communion with the True  
 God and that of Devils, in  
 four Particulars, p. 86  
 Whence Bread and Wine in the  
 Holy Eucharist were even in  
 the Age of the Apostles call'd  
 Gifts and Offerings, p. 87  
 And Ministers of the Gospel, Of-  
 ferers and Sacrificers, as also  
 Waiters at the Altar, &c. *ib.*  
 Some Passages of St. Clement  
 express for this, p. 87, 88  
 St. Cyprian, and the Cyprianic  
 Age, bearing Testimony to it,  
 p. 89  
 The Elements hence ordinarily  
 call'd Δῶρα and Ἀσκή Δῶρα  
 Modern Vouchers for this. 1. Mr.  
 Mede in his Christian Sacrifice.  
 2. Dr. Grabe in his Annotati-  
 ons on St. Irenæus. 3. Bishop  
 Beveridge in his Notes on the  
 ancient Canons. And 4. Bi-  
 shop Bull in his Answer to the  
 Bp. of Meaux, p. 90, 91, *Marg.*  
 Both our old Saxon Ancestors and  
 first Reformers believ'd it a  
 real Sacrifice, p. 91  
 S. X. [2] From another Ar-  
 gument of the same Apostle, clear-  
 ly alluding to the Ministrations  
 of the Christian Sacrifice. As  
 1st. To the Oblation of the Ele-  
 ments.  
 Ηἱς Περσφορα ἡ εὐχὴν being  
 interpreted either of  
 1. The Offering of the Gentiles,  
 as understood by St. Justin,  
 St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian,  
 &c. p. 94  
 And so interpreted by Grotius,  
*ibid.* *Marg.* or else of  
 2. The offering up of the Gentiles,  
 as understood of the Apostle's  
 Sacerdotal Power, p. 95, 96  
 As interpreted by Castalio. p. 98,  
*Marg.*  
 2dly.



## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

- 2dly. To the Sanctification of the Elements by the Descent of the Holy Ghost. p. 103
- The Prayer of Invocation for this Descent of Apostolical Authority, according to St. Basil and St. Chrysostom. p. 92, 93, marg.
- How the ancient Church thought the Holy Spirit to be the chief Agent in the Ministration of the Eucharist, p. 95, &c.
- And Christian Priests his Co-Agents, Ἐκπρὸς ᾧ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, p. 96
- St. Paul truly the Priest of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles: this shew'd 1. From the use of the Word Ἀσπρῦς, being the same with Cohen, p. 98. 2. Of ἱερεῖον, a Sacrificing Minister, p. 93. Of τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, the Subject of his Priestly Ministration, ibid.
4. Paraphrase on Rom. xv. 15, 16, p. 98.
- The Primitive Notion of the Eucharist's being the Oblation of the Gentiles, p.
- An Account of Justin Martyr, concerning the Institution of the Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice, p. 99---102
- Christian Priests as proper Priests as the Priests of Mithra, p. 100
- Oblation of Bread and Water in the Mysteries of Mithra, ibid.
- The Eucharistical Oblation properly TEΛΕΤΗ, a solemn material Sacrifice; and the Ministers of it ΤΕΛΕΣΤΑΙ, ibid.
- The same, why call'd Τελεῖον in the Canons, and Τελεῖσις, p. 101. see marg.
- The Account of Irenæus concerning it. p. 102.
- The Testimonies of Eusebius and Symmachus for it, p. 103
- An Appeal to the common Sense of Mankind, concerning solemn Sacrificial Entertainments. ibid.
- The Practice of the Primitive Church, and of our Church at the Reformation, to mix Water with the Wine. ibid. in marg.
- The whole Eucharistical Action a Sacrificial Mystery, p. 104
- The Notion of such a Mystery stated, ibid.
- Every Federal Sacrifice a Sacrament also, p. 105
- The Offering of Bread and Wine taken in a proper and literal Sense by the Primitive Christians, and by all the Churches before the Reformation, p. 105, 106
- Attestations hereof from, 1. Chrysostom. 2. Basil. 3. Eulogius Alexandrinus. 4. Hildore. 5. Eusebius Cesariensis, ibid. in marg.
- And from the Jewish Doctors also, ibid.
- But were it only a Sacrament, the Ministers of it must nevertheless be proper Priests, p. 106 107
- This prov'd from the Definition of a Priest; from the Usage of Sacerdotal Terms; and from Mystical Rites and Offices, p. 107
- Melchisedech a Type of Christ, and his Priesthood, in bringing forth Bread and Wine, as a Type of the Eucharistical Oblation, when he blessed Abraham, p. 107, 108, 117
- A Notion not scrupled at by the Primitive Christians, who were yet as afraid of Idolatry as any can now be. ibid. marg.
- Their common Belief, that this was

# CONTENTS

- was the Pure Offering fore-  
told by Malachi, p. 108,  
109, marg.
- The Faith and Practice of the  
first Council of Nice as to this  
Matter,* p. 109
- What the Nicene Fathers under-  
stood by Ἀθύρωσ, applied to  
the Eucharistical Sacrifice,*  
p. 109, &c. marg.
- How, and why this came to be  
call'd the unbloody Oblation.*  
p. 110
- Which is confirm'd by a Passage of  
Constantine the Great,* p. 111
- Also both by Christians and Jews,*  
ibid.
- Two Texts of St. Peter concern-  
ing the Priestly Policy of the  
Church hereupon vindicated  
from a common Mistake,* p. 111,  
112
- The Jewish and Christian Theo-  
cracy hence compar'd,* ibid.  
and in marg.
- This Theocratical Constitution of  
the Church or a Priestly King-  
dom the sentiment of Primi-  
tive Antiquity,* p. 112, 113
- The Oblation of the Bread and  
Wine, as the Symbol hereof,  
prov'd a Catholick Practice,* ib.
- (1.) *This anciently thought so  
principal a part of the Holy  
Communion, as the whole was  
signifi'd by it; and thence call'd  
in the Greek Church ἡ εὐχαριστία,*  
p. 113, and *Εὐχάρια,* p. 114
- As in the ancient Latin Church,  
Oblatio,* p. 114, &c.
- (2.) *This Oblation of the Ele-  
ments upon the Altar, plainly  
distinguish'd by the ancient  
Christians from all other Al-  
tar-Offerings,* p. 115
- (3.) *This admitted in the Rea-  
sonings of the Orthodox Fathers*  
*of the second Council of Nice a-  
gainst the Use of Images in  
Divine Worship,* p. 116
- Their Medium between the Jew-  
ish and Gentile Religion,* p. 117
4. *This figur'd according to the  
Ancients by the offering of Mel-  
chisedech,* ibid.
- That this Melchisedech did (as  
a Priest) really offer Bread and  
Wine, with which he made his  
Entertainment; which was an  
Eucharistical Festival.* ibid.
- And that Christ did as really of-  
fer Bread and Wine to the Fa-  
ther, when he instituted the  
Eucharist,* p. 118
5. *Two Oblations of the Elements  
in the Eucharist plainly distin-  
guish'd,* ibid.
1. *By Justin Martyr.*
2. *By the Apostolical Constitu-  
tions,* p. 119
3. *By St. Cyril of Jerusalem.*
4. *By our present Liturgy.*
- Solemn Rites attending our se-  
cond Eucharistical Oblation,*  
p. 120
- This truly call'd a Sacrifice of  
Praise,* p. 111 and 120
6. *This demonstr'd from the  
Primitive manner of the Admi-  
nistration of it,* p. 120--146
- As, 1. the Liturgical Account of  
it in the Apostolical Constitu-  
tions;* p. 121, &c.
- Explain'd and confirm'd by an-  
cient Fathers,* &c. p. 122. marg.  
&c. p. 125.
2. *The Æthiopick Liturgy,* p. 123  
marg.
- An Observation upon it of moment,  
respecting the Arian Controver-  
sy,* ibid.
3. *The Liturgy of St. Chrysos-  
tom,* p. 127
4. *That of St. Basil,* p. 128
5. *That*

## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

5. *That of the Church of Jerusalem,* p. 130
6. *That of the Church of Alexandria, call'd St. Mark's,* p. 131
7. *That of the Church of Rome, call'd St. Peter's* p. 133
8. *The Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great,* p. 136
9. *The Codices Sacramentorum, published by J. M. Thomafius,* p. 138
10. *The ancient Gallican Liturgy,* p. 139
- The harmonious Agreement of Liturgies and Fathers,* p. 140
- Particulars in which all the ancient Liturgies are agreed unanimously,* ibid.
- The Eucharistical Office in the Apostolical Constitutions the true Standard,* p. 141
- Innovations and Additions how to be discover'd,* ibid.
- These are of two sorts, viz. 1st, more ancient; as,*
  1. *The Use of Incense. A Censure hence on Hippol. de Consumat. Mund.*
  2. *The Oratio Propositionis.*
  3. *The Oratio Velaminis.*
2. *More modern,* p. 145
- And both these either 1. Good, or 2. Bad,* ibid.
- Instances of Alterations for the better,* p. 143, 144
- The  $\sigma\mu\nu\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, &c.* p. 143
- Upon what Occasions introduced by the Church,* ibid.
- Instances of Alterations for the worse,* p. 145
- When and how introduced,* ibid.
- The Liturgies most abominably corrupted after the second Council of Nice,* ibid.
- Objections against this Notion of the Christian Sacrifice examin'd,* p. 146--179
1. *The Objection from Dr. Ourram's Definition of a Sacrifice stated,* p. 146
- Answer'd*
  1. *From the Authority of such as must needs know the nature of Sacrifices, both Jewish and Christian, ibid. And could see no Inconsistence between the Notion of a Sacrifice, and that of the holy Eucharist,* p. 147
  2. *From the difference of a Jewish and Christian Sacrifice, through the change of the Priesthood,* p. 148, 149
  3. *From the Silence both of Scripture and Tradition for the Consumption of the Elements in the Jewish manner,* p. 150
  4. *From the putative Consumption thereof, or Mutation, by virtue of the mystical Union between the Sacramental and Natural Body of Christ,* p. 150--153
- This explain'd by what the Roman Laws call Fictio,* p. 151
- Instances of such a sort of Fiction in several cases,* ibid.
- Particularly,*
  1. *In the Civil Polity of Kingdoms, and ordinary Administration of Justice,* ibid.
  2. *In Divinity; and God's Oeconomy in the Restauration of Man,* p. 152
- Exemplify'd 1. in Matrimony:*
  2. *in the Doctrine of Justification: and 3. in that, of Adoption,* ibid.
5. *From the Definition not being general, but of one Species only of Jewish Sacrifices,* p. 153
- For it excludes many Jewish Oblations, ibid. As 1. The Corban, Vatablus, and the Jewish Com-*

# C O N T E N T S

- Commentator.* 2. *The red Heifer*, Abarbanel. 3. *The Scape-goat*, Maimonides. *With whom also agree St. Barnabas and Justin Martyr: And of Moderns Mr. Ainsworth, Bishop Patrick, Dr. Bright,* *ibid.* &c. *Sacrifices and Oblations equivalent Terms in the Old Testament,* p. 154
- The Authors own Description of a Sacrifice; as taken either for*
1. *The Administration, or Act,* p. 154. *Or else,*
  2. *The Matter of the Sacrifice, or Gift,* *ibid.*
- The several Parts of it explain'd,* p. 155-165
1. *Its Subject; a Gift,* p. 160
- The difference of Gifts dedicated and offer'd,* p. 161
- Of Corban, Δέρον, Donum and Cherettri: And Ἀνάθημα, Donarium,* *ibid.* marg.
- Circumstances of time and place,* p. 162
2. *Its Object; the God, to whom it is*
  1. *Brought,* p. 161
  2. *Offer'd,* *ibid.*
- Ritual Observations about it,* p. 162
3. *Its efficient; the Priest,* p. 160, 162
  1. *Ordinary,* *ibid.*
  2. *Extraordinary,* p. 184
  4. *Its end; the Worship of the God,* p. 163
- The chief End of Burnt-offerings,* p. 164. marg.
- The excellent Author of the Propitiatory Oblation in the holy Eucharist referr'd to,* p. 165
- The Objection from Dr. Cudworth's new Notion of the Lord's Supper examin'd.*
- His Notion how far agreeable and disagreeable, with the Ancient*
- Notion of it,* p. 167
- Of no Authority, because it is New,* p. 169, 173
- Against the Faith and Practice of all Churches for 1500 Years,* *ibid.*
- And a perfect contradiction to Justin Martyr's famous Description of the holy Eucharist,* p. 170
- As well as to the consentient Testimony of Apostolical Fathers; such as* 1. *St. Clement.* 2. *St. Ignatius,* p. 170, 173
- Who most likely to understand St. Paul a fellow-labourer of his, or a modern Doctor,* *ibid.*
- The Eucharistical Office of Prayer anciently call'd Πρεσβυτεριον,* p. 168. marg.
- God's Meat, and the Bread of God, whence apply'd to the Jewish Sacrifices, and to the Eucharistical Bread,* p. 171. marg. and 172
- The Ground of his Mistake that Christians have no Altar consider'd,* p. 171
- His Assertion contrary to Fact,* p. 170
- And without any Concinnity to the Nature of the thing,* p. 172
1. *The Singularity,* p. 170
  2. *Nicety,* p. 174. 3. *Uselessness, and* 4. *Dangerous Consequences of this Notion tax'd,* p. 174, 175
- Evidences from ancient Fathers and Ecclesiastical Writers against this novel Hypothesis,* p. 172, 173. marg.
- Tertullian is a better Expositor of himself, than any modern Author,* p. 173. *His Participatio Sacrificii interpreted in his own words,* *ibid.* marg.
- Sacrificial Phrases us'd by him,* p. 174. m. A



## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

- A fair Challenge about Sacrificial Feasts, and the Notion of Epulum ex Oblatis*, p. 170, 172, 175  
*The whole Matter decided by the Rule of Vincentius Lirinensis*, p. 175 marg.  
*Yet the Truth of this Doctor's Notion even suppos'd, Christian Ministers must be still proper Priests*, p. 175, 176  
*A serious Expostulation concerning the Defect of administering the Eucharist only as a Sacrament*, p. 177
- III. *Dr. Forbes's Description of the Holy Eucharist, consider'd*, p. 178  
*'Tis a perfect Description of a Sacrifice in four Particulars*, p. 179  
*His inconsistent Reasoning upon it*, ibid.
- §. XI. 3. *An Argument from their being Ministers of the Archetypal Melchisedec*, p. 180, ---186  
*As Christ is a Priest by Commission from his Father, so Christian Bishops and Presbyters are Priests by Commission from Him*, p. 180, &c.  
*No Man but who is divinely authoriz'd, can exercise the Office of a Priest without Sacrilege*, p. 183, 184, 194 marg.  
*Of extraordinary Commissions*, p. 184, 185  
*The Law of an Hour*, ibid.  
*How David and Solomon sacrific'd as Prophets*, p. 185  
*But Saul and Uzziah being none, forfeited thereby the Kingdom*, p. 186
- §. IIX. *From the Nature of their Office*, p. 186, ---201  
 [1.] *Priests by their Office separated to Mediate and make Intercession for the People*, p. 186  
*This shew'd from the Consent of all Nations*, p. 187  
*The Persian Priests in Herodotus*, p. 188  
*Chryses the Priest of Apollo in Homer*, ibid.  
*How Homer herein Hebraizes*, p. 189  
*A Passage of Alcuin to his Scholar Eanbold, Archbishop of York*, ibid.  
*Two Testimonies from St. Ambrose*, ibid. p. 190  
*Priests whence call'd Kadaglad, or Purgators*, p. 191  
*Allusions hereto both by St. John and St. Paul*, ibid.  
*Evangelical Ministers are proper Purgators*, p. 192  
*The Levitical and Evangelical Priesthood as to this, compar'd*, ibid. & in marg. p. 200, 201, 221  
*The Patriarchal Priesthood, a Confirmation of this*, p. 193  
*Instances hereof in Abraham, Melchisedec, Abel, &c.* ibid.  
*See also marg. and p. 194 in marg.*  
*Also in Noah*, p. 194. *Job*, ibid.  
*and Moses*, p. 195  
*Moses properly a Sacerdotal Prince*, ibid. *An Hypercritical Emendation of Grotius set hereupon to Rights*, out of Philo and Nazianzen, ibid. marg.  
*His Commission to the Family-Priests, the First-born, accounted for. See marg. Several Instances besides of Sacerdotal Intercession in him*, p. 196, &c.  
*The Atonement of the Aaronical Priesthood*, p. 197  
*Samuel's Priestly Mediation*, p. 198

# CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><i>The Intercessorial Office of Priests where describ'd in Scripture,</i><br/> <i>ibid. &amp;c.</i></p> <p><i>St. Hierom's Application of Joel ii, 17. to Christian Priests, as attested by Miracle,</i> p. 199<br/> <i>marg.</i></p> <p><i>Descriptions of the Jewish Priests,</i><br/> <i>p. 199</i></p> <p><i>The Author's Definition of a Priest,</i><br/> <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>Dr. Outram's Definition of the same,</i> p. 200.<br/> <i>Another of his,</i> p. 202</p> <p><i>According to which, Christian Liturgs must be as proper Priests as the Jewish,</i> <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>Of Sacerdotal Benediction, and the great Obstruction to it,</i><br/> <i>p. 200</i></p> <p><i>Intercession by Prophets Jure Prophetico,</i> p. 201</p> <p><i>S. XIII. From the Translation of the Priesthood,</i> p. 202, 206</p> <p>[<i>a.</i>] <i>Christian Ministers by their Office made by Christ Mediators or Intercessors with God for the People,</i> p. 202</p> <p><i>This the most proper and distinguishing Office of the Priesthood,</i><br/> <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>1. Which in the greatest Propriety belongs to the Ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ μόνος,</i> p. 202, 203</p> <p><i>The Epistle to the Hebrews herein illustrated by two Passages of Philo,</i> p. 203, <i>marg.</i></p> <p><i>2. And is by him communicated to his ministering Priests,</i> p. 204</p> <p><i>Who are not inferior to the Patriarchal and Jewish Ministers, in the Essentials of the Sacerdotal Office,</i> p. 205</p> <p><i>But rather superior to them,</i><br/> <i>p. 204, 210</i></p> <p><i>The same common Office, tho' not the same Rites of Attonement,</i></p> | <p><i>p. 205. See marg.</i></p> <p><i>S. XIV. From Apostolical Precept and Practice,</i> p. 206</p> <p><i>The first Ministers of Christ in his Church, were in Fact such Advocates, &amp;c.</i> p. 206</p> <p><i>This shewn,</i></p> <p><i>1. By their Baptising for the Remission of Sins,</i> <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>2. By their solemn Intercessions in the Eucharist,</i> p. 102</p> <p><i>The proper Distinction between Sacrificare and Litare,</i> <i>ibid. in marg.</i></p> <p><i>Extraordinary Commissions, as in the old so in the New Testament also, for Prophetical Priests,</i><br/> <i>p. 208</i></p> <p><i>A Place of St. Paul so interpreted by the ancient Fathers, with respect to the Celebration of the Eucharist,</i> <i>ibid.</i></p> <p><i>Another to shew, that in the Beginning of Christianity, it was the Work of inspir'd Ministers to make Intercessions,</i> p. 209<br/> <i>See marg.</i></p> <p><i>A third of St. James, to shew the Primitive Practice of Priestly Intercession for the Sick, by Imposition of Hands, and Union,</i> p. 210</p> <p><i>The Analogy hereof with the Jewish Priesthood, and the Dignity of the Christian above it, excellently set forth by St. Chrysostom,</i> p. 210, 211, 212</p> <p><i>A fourth Argument for the Usage of this Sacerdotal Intercession, from the Request of Simon Magus to St. Peter,</i> p. 212</p> <p><i>A fifth from other solemn Sacerdotal Acts of the Apostles, and first Ministers of the Church,</i> <i>ibid. &amp;c.</i></p> <p><i>A sixth, St. Paul's Exhortation</i></p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

- to St. Timothy for Sacerdotal Supplications, &c. in the Eucharistical Office, p. 213, as interpreted by St. Augustin, *ibid.*
- And as favour'd by two learned Moderns, p. 214
- A seventh, from the Apostolical Forms of Benediction, p. 216, &c.
- Of the Priest's Actual and Virtual Presence, p. 219
- §. XV. Consequences from the contrary Opinion, p. 220, 224, and 229
- If Christian Ministers be not Priests,
1. They are inferior in Dignity and Utility to the Jewish Ministers, p. 221
  2. They are guilty of Sacrilege in arrogating to themselves the most proper part of the Priest's Office, *ibid.*
  3. The ancient Prophecies concerning the Evangelical Priesthood, are unfulfill'd, p. 222
- The Geneva Notes upon Isaiah lxvi, 21, and Jer. xxx, 17, partial and absurd, *ibid.* and p. 223 marg.
- §. XVI. Advantages which the Notion of a Metaphorical Priesthood affords to the Deists, &c.
1. That Metaphorical Priests are not Priests at all, p. 224
  2. That the Apostolical and other Primitive Fathers, must have been Enthusiasts for holding the Real Christian Priesthood, *ibid.*
- Or,
3. That they must be Knaves; and that all is mere Priestcraft, *ibid.* &c.
  4. That Ministers without Priesthood, can have no Right to Tithes, p. 230
  5. Nor to stand before God as Advocates through Christ for the People, p. 225
  6. Nor to Bless them in his Name, p. 216, 225
  7. That as they are but Mock-Priests, so he whose Ministers they are, is no True Priest, p. 226, &c.
- Compassionate Reflections upon the Practice of some of the Clergy, p. 227, 228
- §. XVII. A Recapitulation of the Genuine Consequences of not asserting the Sacerdotal Dignity both of Bishops and Presbyters, p. 229
- The Author's Congratulatory Address to his Correspondent, p. 230
- His Parenthesis to quicken others of his Order to stand up for the Original Rights of the Christian Priesthood, *ibid.*
- Since the contrary Notion tends to,
1. The Dishonour and Depravation of the Clergy, p. 229
  2. The Secularizing their Manners, p. 226, 229
  3. The Debasing their Ministry in the Esteem of the People, *ibid.*
  4. The Decay of Christian Piety and Religion, and Growth of Deism and Infidelity: And,
  5. The total Dissolution of the Church, p. 230, &c.

# CONTENTS

## CHAP. III.

Reasons why the Writers of the New Testament did abstain from the Name, and yet express the Thing signified by it.

- (3) **W**HY, and how, it came to pass that the Ministers of Christ being proper Priests under Him, are not call'd by that Name in the Writings of the N. Testament, p. 231
- §. I. How the Priestly Office of the Messias was not taught expressly by any of the Apostles till about thirty Years after the Foundation of his Church, p. 232, &c.
- How and why none of his Apostles, or other Ministers did, during that time, expressly call themselves Priests, or their Ministry a Priesthood, p. 233, &c.
- How and why they did also then forbear to use the proper Words for Temple, or House of God, in speaking of Places set apart for Christian Worship. *ibid.*
- How studiously this was declin'd by St. Paul, when a proper Occasion for it was given. *ibid.*
- A probable Reason for this long Silence of our Saviour's Priesthood, as well as of that which depended upon it, p. 234.
- §. II. The first Reason for the Forbearance of the Apostles to take upon them the Sacerdotal Title, p. 234--240
- Its not being mention'd in their Commission, *ibid.*
1. That Christ gave forth his first Commission, as to Apostles; not as to Priests, p. 234, 235
- The great Reasonableness of so doing, *ibid.*
2. That he did not alter their Character after his Resurrection, when their Commission was enlarg'd, p. 236
- What is included in the Character of the Apostleship, *ibid.*
- How the Apostles were Vicars of Christ, no less in his Sacerdotal, than in his Prophetical Office, p. 237
- The Names of Bishops and Presbyters relate but to the Regal and Prophetical Offices of Christ *ibid.*
- A noble Testimony of Origen for the Archetypal Presbytership, Priesthood, and Episcopacy in Christ, *ibid.*
- Christ the *Ἀντὶτύπος* according to the Antients, p. 238
- The Apostles hence must have had a Ministerial Priesthood and Episcopacy under him; as also their Successors, p. 237, 238.
- According to Origen and Nazianzen; as also St. Ignatius, *ibid.*
- The Testimony of Polycrates for the Priesthood of St. John in particular, p. 238. An Observation concerning his wearing the Pontifical Plate, *ibid.*
- A Passage in Epiphanius concerning James the Just, corrected by Petavius, *ibid.* marg.
- The just Inference to be made hereupon, p. 239
- §. III.



## Of the Christian Priesthood Asserted.

§. III. The second Reason for their Forbearance to take upon them the Sacerdotal Title, p. 240--

245  
The more easie Conversion of the Jews, *ibid.*

The Regard they were to have to the Jewish Religion, and Temple-Oeconomy for a Season,

p. 240  
For this Reason they comply'd with the Temple-Worship, as far as they could with any Safety, p. 241

The great Reasonableness of this Method shew'd, p. 242, &c.

But when the Jews reject'd and blasphem'd Christ, they then broke off Communion with them, shaking off the Dust of their Feet against them, p. 244

§. IV. The third Reason for their Forbearance, might probably be a particular Direction from their Lord so to do, p. 245

The Author's Ground for such a particular Direction, viz. That all Appearance of Schism by two different Altars at the same time among one People was to be avoided, p. 246

An Observation of Baron Spanheim concerning the Unity of the Altar, and Worship of the Heathen Deities, *ibid.* Marg.

Three Arguments which shew this no precarious Supposition, p. 247

§. V. That such a Forbearance in the Apostles, if not by express Command, must at least have been by Allowance, p. 247---

251  
The Difference between Direction and Permission in a Supreme Lawgiver but small. p. 247

The Compliance in the Apostles

with the Mosaical Observances, do necessarily infer one or the other, p. 248

The Ground whereof is well express'd by St. Barnabas in his Epistle, p. 249

Yet even during that Period, they are implicitly, and by Intimation, call'd Priests, p. 250

§. VI. That after the Destruction of Jerusalem, the Name Priest was more familiarly us'd, p. 251-263

How and why latter Church-Writers use Words and Phrases not occurring in the former, p. 251

Some Instances herof given, *ibid.*  
Why the Name of Priest and Priesthood came to be more familiar with the Christians after the Destruction of the Temple, *ibid.*

Why yet St. John writing after that time, mentions neither the Name of Priest or Christian, p. 252

Observations upon the Analogy of the Angelical and Sacerdotal Office, *ibid.*

How Christian Liturges are hence to be consider'd, as to their Priesthood, p. 255, &c.

And how as to their Prelacy, or Spiritual Superiority, p. 258

A very good Account hereof out of Mr. Hill De Presbyteratu, p. 259. marg.

Which is clear'd farther from Isidore's Originals, p. 260. mar.

That Bishops, as such, are Princes in Christ's Spiritual Dominions on Earth, according to St. John, p. 261

And are Regal Priests, p. 262, 263

An

# CONTENTS

An Excursion hence concerning the  
Apocalyptical Angels and  
Elders p. 257,---261. The  
Affinity of *αγγελου* and  
*επισκοπου* observ'd. Priests  
call'd Angels, being sent *εὐαγ-  
γελίζον*, and one sort of Sa-  
crifices *ευαγγελία*, p. 252,  
259, marg.  
Though St. John doth not expressly  
call the Bishops Priests, yet

he calls them so by other My-  
stical Names p. 267  
And sets forth their Ministry as  
a proper Priesthood, *ibid.*  
He calls them Priests in the same  
Figurative Way of writing,  
as he calls Christians Jews,  
p. 268  
The Author's Prayer and Con-  
clusion in the Words of St. Am-  
brose, p. 268, 269

# CONTENTS

## OF THE

## Dignity of the Episcopal Order.

### CHAP. I.

An Answer to the first Capital Objection against the  
Episcopal Office being a Free and Spiritual Prin-  
cipality from the Novelty and Impropriety of the  
Expression.

§. I. **T**HE Dignity of the Ar-  
chieratical Office a-  
mong Christians illustrated and  
confirm'd by the common No-  
tions both of Jews and Hea-  
thens concerning the Dignity  
and Authority of their several  
Priesthoods, p. 1--5

1. The Dignity of the Jewish  
Priesthood and Pontificate, ac-  
cording to Philo and Josephus,  
p. 1, 2, 3

The Declaration hereupon of K.  
Agrippa to Caligula, p. 3

2. The Dignity of the Heathen  
Priesthood and Pontificate, as  
set forth by Dr. Potter and  
Grotius, p. 4

3. The Comparison us'd to give  
Christians a true Light, and  
Notion of the Dignity of their  
Priesthood and Episcopacy above  
the other, *ibid.*

4. The harmonious Practice here-  
in of Primitive Christianity,  
*ibid.*

A Passage of St. Ignatius refer-  
ring to the Three honourable  
Orders

## Of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order.

- Orders in the Church, hence illustrated, p. 5
- §. H. The true Notions of the Free Estate of the Church, and its Real Distinction as a Society from the State, settled, p. 5-26
1. Of the Independent Nature of the Church, as an unworldly Society, p. 5
  2. Of the Essential Distinction between Spiritual and Temporal Government, ibid.
  3. Some Reasons why that Distinction is so little understood or considered: viz.
    1. The Abuse of it by the Church of Rome: And
    2. By Dissenters, p. 6
    3. The Neglect of the Clergy: And
    4. The Prejudice of Lawyers, ibid.
  4. This prov'd to be the Language of the Apostles and Apostolical Writers, p. 7-10
 

Bishops were call'd Spiritual Princes, or Prefects, in Scripture. A Bishop call'd by St. Paul

    1. *ἐπίσκοπος*, and 2. *πρεσβυτερος*, being by the Greek and Latin Fathers, thus understood and apply'd, p. 7. and in marg. Also 3. *ἡγούμενος*, which is the very Title given to Christ himself; and by his Disciple St. Clement directly apply'd to the Apostles and their Successors, p. 8. See Marg. and p. 32, 33. As by the Hellenistical Jews to their Prince and High Priest. *ἡγεμονία* us'd by St. Luke for the Supreme Authority, ibid.

The Title of 1. *Ἀρχων* for the same Reason, thus appropriat-

red by Ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, p. 9, 10-32. 2. *Βασιλεὺς*, in the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 32. 3. *Δυναστεύς*, ibid.

5. The Reason of these Princely Titles being given to Christian Bishops, p. 10-19

The Nature, Distinction and Extent of the Spiritual Empire committed to the Bishops; both in general and particular, p. 10. Casaubon de Libertate Ecclesiastica refer'd to for this: See Marg. Which is the Ecclesiastical *Ἀρχὴ* mentioned by the Council of Laodicea; and corroborated by the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, p. 10, 11, &c. 31. with the concurring Evidence of the Primitive Fathers, ibid. their *ἡγεμονία*, p. 12. the Excellence of their Principality, p. 13. their *Δυναστεία*, p. 14. their *Βασιλεία* p. 15 and 32

    6. Wherein and how far the Spiritual Government excells the Temporal, p. 13, 33
    7. That the Bishops Chairs were anciently call'd Thrones, p. 11, 18

The Apostolical Throne, p. 16. Inthronization, p. 17. Catholick and Oecumenical Thrones, ibid. *ἱεραρχία* an holy Principality; Bishop-Rick a Bishop's Principality, ibid. The Chair of every Bishop consider'd as the Throne of Christ, p. 18. of St. James first Bishop of Jerusalem; the Greek Ordinal; Justinian's Code, and Novels; Dr. Louth's Subject of Church-Power, &c. ibid.

Sub-

# CONTENTS

- Subscription in Christi Nomine*, p. 19. Hierom's *Exposition of Isa. lx. 17.* This proved to be most Primitive by *St. Clement*, Cor. xliii. p. 20. And agrees both with *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*, ibid.
8. That they have every thing in their Office that denominate a Prince p. 21-25.
1. An Authority to make Laws for the Society, p. 21
2. A Right to challenge the Obedience of all the Members of it, ibid.
- Of the Fidelity hence required both of the People and Clergy to their Bishop, p. 22, 23, &c. Nothing to be done without him in the Society, p. 21, 24, 25 How he stands in God's and Christ's Stead, p. 18, 24, 26 Words which set forth the eminent Spiritual Power, Authority and Dignity of Bishops, us'd by the Apostles and Apostolical Writers, p. 13, 16, 19, 25, 31
9. That their Authority to make Laws and Orders, and give Directions for the Society, is delegated to them from the Invisible Bishop, whom they represent, p. 24, &c.
- III. The Bishops had originally Power to coerce or compel their Subjects of the Clergy and Laity, without Distinction of Persons, to obey them, by Spiritual Censures and Punishments, p. 26-64
- (1) The Practice herein of the Apostolical Age. p. 26-29
- The Power of Spiritual Coercion, how, and to whom deriv'd, ibid. p. 26.
- How exercis'd, (1.) by the Apostles, p. 27. St. Peter, ibid. St. Paul, p. 28. And St. John. ibid. (2.) By their Successors. p. 29
- The Difference of the Apostolical Rod and Sword, or AX, p. 29, 30, see Marg.
- An Instance where the Church punishes for a Crime which the State allows, p. 30.
- The Rectoral Power cannot subsist without a Coercive of the same kind, p. 31, 33
- That in both these Respects the Episcopal Office is a Spiritual Principality, ibid.
- The Comparison of the two Offices, Regal and Episcopal, p. 34
- A very ancient Description of an Episcopal Consecration, p. 35
- A Christian Bishop held Antiently equal to a Jewish High Priest, p. 36
- (II) The Abuse of this Practice in the latter Ages of the Church, censur'd, p. 36
1. By the Canonists, ibid.
2. By Calvinists, p. 94
- The false and arrogant Maxim of the Canonists, about the Subjection of the Temporal to the Ecclesiastical Power, how introduced. p. 36
- Confuted by the real Difference between these two Powers and Jurisdictions, p. 37
- And stated by Hugo Floriacensis, du Pin and Bishop Beveridge, ibid.
- (III) The Practice of the ancient Greek Church, p. 30-48
- As the same appears by the Testimonies of
1. Constantine the Great, p. 30, and 71
2. The



## Of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order.

2. *The Apostolical Constitutions,*  
p. 31, 35

3. *Gregory Nazianzen,* p. 35, 36

4. *St. Chrysostom,* p. 38, 47

5. *Eusebius,* p. 36

6. *Sozomen,* p. 48

*This Doctrine publickly taught in the Imperial City; and never objected against by the Emperors, even when there was both Opportunity and Inclination so to do,* p. 47

IV. *The Practice of the ancient Latin Church,* p. 48

*The Opinion and Practice of the Fathers of the Latin Church, deliver'd concerning Episcopacy and its Power,* p. 48, &c.

1. *Of St. Cyprian,* p. 48

2. *Of St. Ambrose,* p. 49, 58, and 67

3. *Of Facundus Hermionensis,* p. 52

4. *Of Paulinus,* p. 53, 54, marg.

5. *Of St. Hierom,* p. 64, 65

6. *Of St. Augustin,* *ibid.*

7. *Of Gelasius,* p. 68

V. *The Opinion and Practice of the Christian Emperors from the Beginning,* p. 58---64

*They look'd on themselves as Laicks; and in that respect Subjects of the Church,* p. 58

*The Distinction of Laity and Clergy, not only older than Popery,* p. 59, 60

*But as old even as the very first Ages of Christianity,* p. 60, 75

4. *And acknowledged by our Constitution,* p. 59, and even by H. 8. and Ed. 6. *ibid.*

*The Use of the Word Laity in Scripture,* p. 60

*And in Apostolical Writers,* p. 61, 62

*Thence receiv'd by Tertullian and St. Cyprian,* p. 63

VI. *An Argument for the great Dignity of the Episcopal Office,*

*as prophecy'd of in Psal. xlv, p. 64. And as in v. 16, interpreted both by St. Hierom and St. Augustin, *ibid.* And v. 17, by Eusebius Cesaricensis, p. 65. And as confirm'd by the Decisions of Emperors themselves, as well as of Bishops, in their Letters to them, pursuant to such a Claim.*

*The Difference between Church and State, according to the Bounds which Christ has set betwixt them,* p. 64, 71, 86

*The different Origins and mutual Subordinations of the Spiritual and Temporal Powers, fully set forth, 1. By St. Ambrose, p. 69. 2. By the Emperor Justinian, and the Civil Law of the Empire, *ibid.* See marg. 3. By Hosius in his Letter to Constantius. 4. By Gelasius in his to Anastasius, &c. p. 68, 69, 70. 5. By Symmachus in his to the same Emperor,*

*De Libertate Eccl. and Du Pin, de Antiqua Ecclesie Disciplina, hereupon refer'd to.*

*The Catholic Practice for the first five Hundred Years of the Church, concerning the Liberty and Dignity of the Episcopal Order, how, and by whom chang'd,* p. 73, &c.

*The Mistake of Our Lawyers about the Subjection of the Ecclesiastical to the Temporal Power, how, and when introduc'd,* p. 59, 79

*Considerations upon the Act of Supremacy: viz. That it ought to be taken in a Sense, (1.) Consistent with other Acts of Parliament, and with Magna Charta, p. 75. 2. Which saves, and not which destroys the Distinction of the Sacerdotal from*

the

# CONTENTS

|                                     |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| the Civil Power, p. 76.             | 3. Con-                          |
| sistent with the Spiritual Pow-     | er of the Keys, p. 77            |
| The Confession hereupon of Sir Ed-  | ward Coke, ibid.                 |
| VII. The Objection from Law con-    | sider'd, p. 79--86               |
| How Henry the Eighth exercised      | his modern Supremacy, p. 79      |
| An haughty Preface of his to a      | Latin Bible, p. 78               |
| An Observation on a Medal of his,   | with an arrogant Inscription in  |
| Latin, Greek and Hebrew,            | On the Ecclesiastical Commission |
| given by him to Cromwell,           | p. 81, 82                        |
| Ecclesiastical Preferments and Be-  | nefices given by Edward the      |
| Sixth to this Cromwell and o-       | ther Laymen, p. 81, 83           |
| Reflections upon the Conduct of the | Clergy in those two Reigns,      |
| p. 83                               |                                  |
| The Judgment of Lawyers concer-     | ning the Ecclesiastical Supre-   |
| macy, p. 84                         |                                  |
| Sir Edward Coke wherein faulty,     | p. 84, 85                        |
| A learned Answer to him recom-      | mended, but with two Restri-     |
| ctions, p. 85, 86                   |                                  |
| VIII. Exemption of Persons and      | Goods of the Clergy from Tem-    |
| poral Tribunals, p. 86              |                                  |

|                                    |                                  |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| The Objection from Scripture con-  | sider'd, ibid.                   |
| Our Lord's Injunction to his Apo-  | stles, against assuming Authori- |
| ty and Titles as did not belong    | to them, look'd carefully into,  |
| p. 86, 87, and retorted upon       | the Objectors, ibid.             |
| The honourable Titles of Apostle   | and Bishop, p. 87, 88            |
| The concurrent Testimony of St.    | Chrysostom and St. Hierom,       |
| with the true State of the Case,   | ibid.                            |
| The Character and Testimony of     | Hugo Floriacensis, to the same   |
| Purpose, p. 88, 89                 |                                  |
| Titles of Honour given of old to   | Bishops, p. 89, 90, 91           |
| The Difficulty from a Canon of     | the African Church, examin'd     |
| and the true Sense of it and of    | the whole Catholick Church, dis- |
| cover'd, p. 92                     |                                  |
| That all Bishops are Principes Sa- | cerdotum, and Summi Sacer-       |
| dotes; but none of them Prin-      | cipes Episcoporum, shewn to      |
| be the Sense of Tertullian and     | Facundus Hermionensis, in        |
| Consent with the African Fa-       | thers, p. 92, 93. Also of the    |
| Commentators Balsamon and          | Zonaras, together with St. Hi-   |
| crom, ibid. marg.                  |                                  |

## C H A P. II.

An Answer to the Second Capital Objection against the Dignity and Authority of this Office, from the Church's Independency, being a Presbyterian Doctrine.

**T**HE Distinction of the Power and Polity of the Church from that of the State, by Divine Institution, which Presbyterian Writers so much insist on, is properly no Presbyterian, but a Catholick Doctrine, p. 93

1. The Doctrine of Church-Power and Independency, to be carefully distinguish'd from the Abuse of it, p. 93, 94  
Security against invading the Prince's Rights, and Encroachments in ordine ad Spiritalia, p. 94  
Wherein the Peace of the Church, and

## Of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order.

- and a Christian State consists, *ibid.*
2. The Abuse of this Doctrine, whether by Presbyterians or Papists; no Reflection upon the Doctrine it self, p. 95, 98, 110
  3. How it is founded on positive Divine Institution; but misapply'd by the Presbyterians, p. 95, 97
- Of Presbyterian Mixtures and Corruptions, p. 95, 101, 102
4. Several Truths asserted by the Presbyterians, and excepted against by Spotswood, for having been by them misapply'd; to which the Author here declares his full Assent, p. 95, 96
- Several Passages in their Confession of Faith, and their Books purposely written for the Jus Divinum of the Ecclesiastical Government and Ministry, wherein he likewise joins with them. p. 96
- II. The Misapplication and Abuse of this Power by the Presbyterians, utterly inconsistent with all Civil Order, and contrary to the Gospel, p. 97
  1. This Distinction of the Power and Polity of the Church from that of the State, how determin'd by the Gospel, and how calculated for the Peace of the latter, p. 97
  2. Made and declar'd by Christ himself, *ibid.*
  3. Nothing more visible than it for 300 Years together, p. 98
  4. No sound Doctrine to be rejected, because held by the Church's Enemies in other Matters, *ibid.*
- The Author's Resolution herein, the same as that of St. Ignatius, p. 99
5. The Sentiment of the Independents concerning Church-Power and Independency consider'd, and compar'd with that of the Presbyterians, *ibid.*
- The Independency of the Church on the State, Jure Divino, as laid down by Mr. Nye in his Book about the Oath of Supremacy, p. 99, 100, 101
- Wherein he differs from the Presbyterian Opinion; and how he qualifies that Oath, to make it consistent with his independent Power of the Church by Divine Right, *ibid.*
- III. Nothing contrary to the Regal Supremacy, as qualify'd and explain'd by our Kings and Queens, advanc'd hereupon by the Author, p. 102
- How Bishop Bilson and Sander son were approv'd for what they writ to the very same Purpose; and never yet censur'd for derogating thereby from the Rights of the Prince, p. 103, 104
- Bishop Sander son's Opinion of the Episcopal Order and Office, p. 103. How far it affects the Regal Supremacy, p. 104. His Episcopacy no ways prejudicial to Regal Power, *ibid.* Excellently clear'd by Dr. Lowth, *ib.*
- An Extract out of Bp. Bilson, concerning the Divine Original of the Episcopal Office, and the Monarchical Government of every Church, p. 105, 106, 107. Which is also conformable to the Sentiment of Dr. H. Barrow, p. 136. marg.
- IV. Notwithstanding that some may have invaded the Regal Supremacy, under pretence of this Doctrine, yet it is for that never the less Catholick and Primitive, p. 107
  1. The Abuse of any Power, or the Possibility of its Abuse, the weakest Argument in the World against the Reality of it, p. 107, 108, 109

# CONTENTS

2. The contrary Opinion expos'd to as great, or greater Difficulties; ibid.
3. The Argument of Erastians and Super-Erastians most novel and dangerous. p. 108, 109
4. The true State of the Saxon Church, p. 109
5. By whom the first Invasion was made upon the Rights and Liberties of the English Clergy, ib.
6. 'Tis remarkable, that the English People lost also their Rights and Liberties by the same, ibid.
7. There's as much reason for owning the Rectoral as the Doctoral Authority of Christian Bishops, p. 110
- These anciently recogniz'd as Christ's Vicegerents in his Kingdom, independent of the Kingdoms of the World, p. 111
- And as such obey'd by all Ranks of Christians; as well after as before the Empire became Christian; Emperors not excepted, ibid.
- Critical and Miscellaneous Remarks,
- Honourable Titles and Appellations anciently given to Christian Bishops. 1. *μεγας*, p. 7, 32 m. *μεγας* *αυτος*, and *Αντιστες*, p. 7, m. & p. 69. 3. *Ηγουμεν* and *Ηγουμεν* *αυτος*, p. 8. m. and 68 m. 4. *Αρχων*, p. 9, 11, m. 5. *Κυριος*, p. 89, and Dominus Sanctus, p. 91. 6. *Δεσποτης*, p. 90. 7. Papa, a general Name for all Bishops, ib.
- Words setting forth the eminent Dignity and Authority of the Episcopal Office. 1. *Αρχ.* 2. *Ιεραρχια*, Hierarchy. 3. *Ηγεμονια*. 4. *Εξουσια*. 5. *Αριστοκρα.* 6. *Τραπικ.* 7. *Δουκισια*. 8. *Βασιλεια*. 9. *Εκκλησια*. 10. *Θεοκρα.*, p. 7, 8, 9,

10, 11, 12, 33, 34, 41, 68, 69  
 Words expressing the Subjection and Obedience due to them, both from Clergy and Laity. 1. *Ειδεσθαι*, to value, esteem, and regard. 2. *Προσχευ*, to have a deference to. 3. *Διχεισθαι*, to recognize and submit to. 4. *Παρασχευ*, to obey. 5. *Ακολουθευ*, to adhere to with the highest Fidelity. 6. *Υποτασθαι*, to be subordinate in their respective Lots; and *Αντιστασθαι*, to rebel, or go out of their Order. 7. *Αναψυχευ*. 8. *Κυρωσθαι*, p. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, m. *Επισκοπος* and *Βασις*, in Hesychius the same, p. 34  
*Ιερευς* and *Sacerdos* us'd to signify a Bishop, p. 39. marg. And *Ιερωσυν* for the Episcopal Dignity, p. 23, & 39, m.  
*Αντις* *Αυτοκρα.* in St. Clement, &c. p. 61, m. and *Ααδς*, p. 62  
*Παπ* *αυτος*, a Name given in Scripture to the Laity, p. 61, 62, and 61 marg. *Πατριστα* for the same, p. 62  
 Rules of the Canon Law concerning the Sacerdotal Rights, p. 46, 47, m. 67 m. 70 m.  
 Rules of the Civil Law concerning them, p. 67, marg.  
 St. Ambrose's Treatment of the Emperor Theodosius, approv'd by the Ch. of England, p. 53, m.  
 The ancient Custom of Emperors bowing the Head at receiving the Bishop's Blessing, p. 38  
 An Apology for making use of the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 35  
 Father, a Solemn Appellation of God with Jews and Pagans, p. 2, marg.  
 The Abrahamical Old Father, a Title given to Hosius, p. 68  
 The Medal of King Hen. 8. p. 80



A PREFATORY  
DISCOURSE  
IN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
**Rights of the Christian Church.**

SOME Years since I happened to be in the Country, where a <sup>a</sup> worthy Lady did me the Honour to invite me to her House, and to make some stay there. I had been little more than a Day with her, when I perceiv'd what a venerable Prelate had told me of her some Years before, that she was a Person of great Memory, clear Understanding, penetrating Judgment, and much Reading; and that particularly she was perfect Mistress of the Controversy between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, having thoroughly examin'd it in almost all the Books, that had been written on both sides in her Mother Tongue. In her younger Years, living among Roman Catholicks,

<sup>a</sup> Of whom see an Account in p. viii. of my Preface to the Second Collection of Controversial Letters relating to the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*; printed for Richard Sare at Gray's-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1710.

she was perverted by them about the time of the *King's Martyrdom*, and continued some Years in their Communion, but not without Doubts, and Dissatisfactions, which daily encreasing both in number and degree, she confessed them to the Priests, particularly to the famous Father *Turbeville*; from whom not receiving Satisfaction, she returned to her Mother the Church of *England*, and, like Mr. *Chillingworth*, was still the more able to defend her self against them, for having been one of them. She wrote her Reasons, for which she left their Communion, in a very civil Letter to the Father abovementioned; but he never returned any Answer to it: The Force of it was too great for a Reply to such a Judgment, and Understanding as *hers*, who had a clear View of the Controversy; and as she did me the Honour to impart a Copy of that <sup>b</sup> Letter to me in her own Writing; so at my Request she let me transcribe it, which I did with much Satisfaction, and Delight.

As we talked of things relating to this Controversy, she told me, she thought nothing was so needful to the understanding of it, or any other Controversies, which the Church of *England* had with any of her Adversaries, as to have a right, and compleat notion of the Church; all Disputes about Religion, as she observed, being about the *Doctrine*, or *Government*, or *Worship* of the Church. And tho' I hope, said she, the Notions I have of it are true, yet I doubt whether I have all the Notions that belong to it. For when I exercise my Thoughts about it, methinks I find something defective in my Conceptions of it, though I cannot tell what it is.

I perceived by a little more Discourse with her, that by the Notion of a Church, she meant the No-

---

<sup>b</sup> That Letter is printed in the *Collection of Controversial Letters* above cited in the Margin.

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* iii

tion of it, as a *Society*, and that it would be useful and grateful to her to help her to range the Conceptions she had of it, as such; for I suspected, that tho' they were all true, yet they might be imperfect, and perhaps a little confused. I therefore took the liberty to ask her some Questions relating to that Subject in a mathematical sort of Method; in which every following Question was always a Consequent of that which was asked before. She presently perceived my Design, and was much pleased with the Order, in which I propounded my Questions; and I found by her Answers to them, that she wanted nothing requisite to a compleat *Idea* of the Church, as a Spiritual Society, but a more clear understanding of the *Collegiate* Government of it by Bishops, and that Christ had committed the Charge and Care of it *in whole*, as well as *in part*, *jointly*, as well as *separately*, to all the Bishops, as his Vicegerents; and that by consequence, not only the Bishops of every Province, but of the whole Catholick Church were Fellows, and Colleagues. She discover'd much Satisfaction, in being made Mistress of this Notion, which, *she said*, encreas'd her Admiration of the Wisdom of God in the Constitution of his Church, and in securing the Christian Priesthood by such a Constitution; and helped her to apprehend some things better, than she did before, as how much this co-ordinate Union of it depended on the Unity of the Episcopal College, That its Union with the State in all Countries was only *social* and *federal*, and not an *incorporating* Union, and also that the Pope's Supremacy was a most groundless Pretension; and a monstrous, and intolerable Usurpation over the Catholick Church.

Our Conference being ended, she desired me to turn my Questions, and the Discourses incident to them, into *Propositions*, which I did after some time, and waited upon her with them. It happened that

I found a very pious, and worthy Gentleman, a Serjeant at Law, at her House, to whose Care, and Protection her Husband had left her, upon his Death-bed, as to a most honest Gentleman, skilful Lawyer, and faithful Friend. She desired me to let her shew him my Propositions, to which I readily consented; and he, after he had read them, with great Civility natural to him, desired the Freedom to object against them; but I told him I would first send him, in a Letter, a more compleat Copy of them to read again, with *Notes*, and then, upon second Thoughts, he might return them to me, with his Objections in Writing; which he shortly after did in a Letter, to which the *second* Letter in the following Book was my Answer. But to my great Grief, and the Grief of all who knew the very worthy Man, he died before I could get it transcribed.

After I had got a fair Copy, I gave a Learned Divine an account of it, who thereupon was desirous to read it, and the Propositions I sent him with it. I told him I would consent to his Desire, if he would promise to read them as an Adversary, because he could not otherwise read them as a Friend; and when he had read them, he sent them to me with an Objection, which he said would be made against my *fourth Proposition*; an Objection indeed somewhat surprising, which in the beginning of my *first* Letter, that is my Answer to it, I have recited in his own Words.

I am sensible I ought to beg the Reader's Pardon, for so long an account of the Occasions of writing those *two Letters*, and I hope to obtain it, because I could not well give a shorter account, with due Respect to my Friends, if I gave any at all.

I must farther acquaint the Reader, that as the Objection mention'd in the beginning of the *first* Letter was made against my *fourth Proposition*; so the

Obje-  
cti-



Objection mentioned in the beginning of the *second Letter*, was made against the *third*.

This, I think, obligeth me to present them here to publick View, with the first and second Propositions, without the attendance of which I think they would neither be so orderly, nor so decently introduced, nor perhaps be so satisfactory to the Reader.

## THE PROPOSITIONS.

I. **T**O understand the Constitution of the Catholick Church, as a Society, it will be requisite to observe by what Names it is set forth in the Scriptures, where it is called the <sup>c</sup> Kingdom of God, and <sup>d</sup> Dominion of Christ, the <sup>e</sup> City of God, <sup>f</sup> the House and Household of God; and because this House of God is an holy House, in which he is especially present, it is therefore compar'd to a <sup>g</sup> Temple, wherein he is worshipped by Priests, and People. It is also called the <sup>h</sup> Polity, which we translate the Common-wealth of Israel, and the <sup>i</sup> Body of Christ, to signifie, that it is a Spiritual Society, or

<sup>c</sup> Mat. iv. 23. x. 7. xvi. 28. xxi. 43. Mark i. 14. Luk. i. 32, 33. viii. 1. xxi. 31. Act. i. 3. viii. 12. xx. 25. xxviii. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 24. Col. i. 13.

<sup>d</sup> Dan. ii. 44. vii. 14, 27. Heb. i. 8. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 13. Rev. xvii. 14. xix. 16. Act. ii. 34, 36. Rom. xiv. 9. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>e</sup> Heb. xii. 22. iii. 12. Gal. iv. 25, 26. Ephes. ii. 19.

<sup>f</sup> Heb. iii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Ephes. ii. 19. 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 5. iv. 17.

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 16. vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Ephes. ii. 21, 22.

<sup>h</sup> Ephes. ii. 12.

<sup>i</sup> Ephes. i. 22, 23. iv. 12, 15. v. 23, 30. Rom. xii. 5. 1 Cor. xii. 27. Col. i. 18, 24. Corpus sumus de conscientia Religionis, & disciplina unitate. Tertull. Apol. c. 39. Semel dixerim una Ecclesia sumus, ita nostrum est quodcumque nostrorum est, ceterum dividis Corpus. Idem, de Virgin. Veland. c. 3. Sed nec Ecclesiam defendere qui quando & quibus incunabilis institutum est hoc Corpus, probare non habent, id. de Præscript. c. 22.

*Incorporation, of which Christ is the Head, and all particular Churches are Members.*

II. It is to be considered, that this Kingdom, Dominion, City, <sup>k</sup> Spiritual House, Body, and Polity of Christ, had a Being in the World under its own <sup>l</sup> Magistrates, and Rulers, independent on the secular Powers three hundred Years together, before the Empire became Christian; and after that in the Reigns of Apostate, and Heretical Emperors, who persecuted the Church.

III. Christ the archetypal, eternal Melchisedech, is the <sup>m</sup> King of this Spiritual Kingdom, Lord of this Spiritual Dominion, and Supreme Head of this Spiritual Corporation; and the <sup>n</sup> Bishops, as <sup>o</sup> Successors to the Apostles, are under him by Commission deriv'd from him, Spiritual <sup>p</sup> Lords, Chiefs, and Princes, as well as Priests in

<sup>k</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 5. Ye also as lively Stones are built up a Spiritual House. *Eos ess: Ecclesiam, qui in domo Dei permanent, Cypr. Edit. Oxon. Epist. lxx. Quo Sacramento declaratur in unam domum solam, i. e. in Ecclesiam viduatos, & ab interitu mundi evasuros, colligi oportere. — Non habitans in Domo Dei, i. e. in Ecclesia Dei. Cypr. Epist. lxxix. Hence our Church in her Liturgy fifth Sunday after Epiph. O Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy Church and Household continually in thy true Religion. And 22 Sund. after Trin. Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy Household the Church in continual Godliness.*

<sup>l</sup> Mat. xvi. 19. xviii. 18. Joh. xx. 23. 1 Cor. v. 4, 5. Mark. xvi. 15, 20. Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. Luke xxiv. 49. Matth. x. 16. 1 Cor. i. 1. Rom. i. 1. 2 Cor. i. 1. Gal. i. 1. ii. 12. Act. xx. 28. Heb. v. 4, 5. 2 Chron. xxvi. 18. Matth. x. 40. Luke x. 16. Joh. xiii. 20. Heb. xiii. 7, 17. 1 Cor. v. 12, 1 Thess. v. 12. Act. iv. 19. v. 29. xvii. 7. Luke xxiii. 2. 1 Cor. iv. 21. x. 2. xiii. 10. 1 Tim. v. 1, 20. 2 Tim. iv. 2. Tit. i. 13. ii. 15. Rev. ii. 14, 20.

<sup>m</sup> Οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ βασιλικὸς ἀνθρώπων, ὁ ἱερὰς ὁσὶς Θεός, &c. Therefore this Man who is truly King, he is the holy Priest of God; in like manner as even now among the most possib'd of the barbarous Nations, who take their Kings from among their Priests. *Clem. Alexandr. Strom. Lib. VII. p. 720.*

<sup>n o p</sup> Οἱ Ἀποστολοὶ, &c. Apostoli nobis a Christo evangelizaverunt, Jesus Christus a Deo. Missus enim est Christus a Deo, & Apostoli a Christo, & factum est utrumque ordinate ex voluntate ejus. Mandatum quippe accipientes, & per Resurrectionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi plenā certitudine imbuti, Deique verbo confirmati cum Spiri-

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* vii

*in his Spiritual Kingdom; to whom in their respective spiritual Dominions, and Jurisdictions he requires Obedience of all his Subjects of what temporal Rank, or Condition soever, as to his Stewards, Vicegerents, or chief Ministers over his Church.*

IV. That

*tūs Sancti fiducia egressi sunt, evangelizantes Regni Dei adventum. Per Regiones & Urbes, Regnum Dei prædicantes, primitias (sux prædicationis ad fidem converſas) Spiritu suo probantes, Episcopos, & Ministros eorum qui credituri erant, constituerunt, Clem. 1. Epist. ad Cor. xlii. Apostoli nostri per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum cognoscentes contentionem de nomine Episcopatus oborituram, eam ob causam perfecta scientia præditi, prædictos (i. e. primitias suæ prædicationis, seu Primogenitos in Christo) constituerunt, & deinceps futura successionis regulam tradiderunt, ut cum illi mortui essent, alii viri probati ministerium eorum acciperent, c. xlv. This Testimony of St. Clement, a Fellow-labourer with the Apostles, agrees exactly with the Scriptures, Acts 6. 6. Whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their Hands on them. xiv. 23. And when they had ordained them Elders in every Church. Tit. i. 5. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set things in order, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee. 1 Tim. iv. 14. Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of Hands of the Presbytery. v. 22. Lay Hands suddenly on no Man. 2 Tim. i. 6. I put thee in remembrance to stir up the Gift of God which is in thee by the Imposition of my Hands. Ab Apostolis institutos Episcopos fuisse, & eorum Successores usque ad nos. Irenæus Lib. III. C. III. Edant Origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per Successionem ab initio decurrentem ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis Viris qui tunc cum Apostolis perseveraverint, habuerint auctorem & antecessorem. Tertull. de Præscript. Cap. XXXII. Meminisse autem Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos id est Episcopos & Præpositos Dominus elegit, Diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in Cælos Apostoli sibi constituerunt Episcopatus sui & Ecclesia Ministros. Cyr. Epist. III. Ut unitatem a Domino, & per Apostolos nobis successoribus traditam, quantam possumus, obtinere curemus. Id. Epist. XLII. Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est & Ecclesiis, quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, & Episcopis qui eis Ordinatione vicariâ successerunt. Ibid. Firmil. LXXV. Inde per temporum & successionem vices, Episcoporum Ordinatio, & Ecclesia ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituitur, & omnes actus Ecclesia per eosdem propositos gubernetur, cum hoc itaque divinâ lege fundatum sit, &c. Cyr. Epist. XXXIII. Quamobrem*

IV. That the Church or incorporate Body of Christians is by its Constitution a <sup>9</sup> Holy, Royal, or <sup>r</sup> Regal Priesthood, as it is called in the Scriptures. First, Because Christ the Head of it is the Antitype of Melchisedech, and as such, a Sacerdotal Sovereign, or Regal Priest. And, Secondly, Because this Sacerdotal Sovereign has committed the Government, and Administration of his Kingdom to ministerial Priests, who, as I must often put you in mind, are the <sup>r</sup> Vicars, Substitutes, Legates, Representatives, or Vicegerents of their Royal, Sacerdotal Lord, and Master, in his Kingly, as well as his Priestly Office, throughout all the Districts, and Dominions of his Spiritual Kingdom upon Earth.

After telling the Occasion of writing these two Letters, it will be expected I shou'd give an account of the publishing of them, to which I was provok'd by a late Book, falsely entituled, *The Rights of the Christian Church*: In which the Author,

*frater, si Majestatem Dei, qui Sacerdotes ordinat, cogitaveris, qui arbitrio ac nutu, & presentia sua & Praepositos ipsos, & Ecclesiam cum praepositis gubernat, &c. Cypr. Epist. LXVI. Nec hac jacto, sed dolens profero, cum te judicem Dei constituas ac Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos, & per hoc ad omnes praepositos, qui Apostolis Ordinatione vicariâ succedunt, Qui audit vos me audit—— Ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit Episcopum, nec plebs praepositum nec Ecclesia Gubernatorem, nec Christus Antistitem, nec Deus Sacerdotem. Cypr. Epist. LXVI.*

<sup>9</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. You are built up a Spiritual House, an Holy Priesthood. —— But you are a chosen Generation, a Royal Priesthood, or Kingdom of Priests, Exod. xix. 6.

<sup>r</sup> Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. Trigesima in Consecratione Eulalii Doerensium Episcopi. Δι' ἡς δυνάμει τὰ βέλη τῶν πονηρῶν, &c. But thou shalt receive a more perfect Armour from greater Generals, by which thou mayest be able to quench the fiery Darts of the Devil, and present unto the Lord a peculiar People, a holy Nation, a Regal Priesthood in Christ Jesus the Lord, to whom be Glory for ever. Amen.

<sup>r</sup> Neque enim aliunde Hæreses oborta sunt, aut nata Schismata, quam inde, quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesiâ ad tempus Sacerdos, & Judex vice Christi cogitatur. Cypr. Epist. LIX.

with



with all the Art he was Master of, and with more Spite and Insolence, than *Julian* or any other Apostate did, hath written without any true force of Argument, or making any Distinction of Priests, against the whole Christian Priesthood, and against the Christian Church, and its true Constitution, and *Rights*. Whether the Christian Church is one Body, or several independent Bodies throughout the whole World; and if one Body, whether it is or is not distinct from the State, and independent of it in all places; and whether the Administration of it, was not by Divine Appointment committed to Bishops, as Successors of the Apostles, who are to govern it by continued Succession, from one to another; and whether they, as supreme Governours of it, have not Authority to admit into, and exclude People of all ranks out of it, are all Questions of *Fact*, which are to be determined by the Scriptures, and the consentient Doctrine, and Practice of the Catholick Church, consisting both of Priests, and People; of which, I hope, I have given a plain and sufficient account, especially in the *second* Letter. And the Reader is to be judge, whether the Reasonings of this Author, (who hath licked up the Venom of *Hobbes*, *Selden*, *Spinoza*, and *Marvel*, and disgorged it upon the Church) can be of any force against the Testimony of such a cloud of Witnesses, against the joint Authority of so many holy Saints, and Martyrs, even of all Christianity, from the time of the Apostles, and whether it was not most absurd in him to argue against *Facts* so proved, and a Constitution so universally admitted, and receiv'd for Divine in all places, as if all Christians hitherto had been deluded, or as if there

---

\* Both which are thoroughly confuted in 116 small Octavo Pages of the first part of a Book entituled, *The Case of the Church of England*, by *S. P.* printed at London 1681. And in those few Pages the Reader will find a full Answer to the *Rights of the Christian Church*.

## A Prefatory Discourse

neither were, nor could be any such Constitution, which in his false reasoning he misrepresents, as *absurd, uncharitable, inconsistent with Reason, and the ends of Ecclesiastical Discipline, an Obstacle to the spreading of the Gospel, destructive of it self, and the Interests of the Christian Religion, and of infinite Mischief to the Christian World, and human Societies.*

These are Charges which were never laid upon the Constitution of the Church in the first, and earliest Ages of Christianity, which had the best means of understanding the Constitution of it, as living nearest the times of its Original. The Christians of those Ages, to which I confine my Enquiry in the *second Letter*, had as great Men among them as ever lived since, and "much greater and more celebrated *Civilians*, than the reputed Author of the *Rights*; and yet they were so blind as not to see the monstrous Faults and Defects in the Building and Oeconomy of Christ's House, and the Polity of his Kingdom, which this Man hath spied in it; or if they did, they were such ill-natured *Timons* of human kind, as not to discover them betimes, to undeceive the deluded World for the Interests of the Christian Religion, and the good of Mankind. This Discovery, it seems, was reserv'd for this blessed Age, and for this incomparable Book. In which, supposing the Constitution of the Church to be such in *Fact*, as ancient Christianity in all places, believed and took it to be, then the Author hath charged God, the Founder and Architect of it, with all the Faults and Flaws he pretends to find in its Fabrick and Constitution, highly blaspheming his infinite Wisdom and Goodness, in foolishly forming a Polity, and Government, so absurd in its Nature, so *destructive to it self, and so inconsistent with the great ends for which it was framed, the Propagation of Chri-*

---

\* Such as *Tribonianus, Theophilus, Dorotheus, &c.*

*stianity,*

stianity, and the Good of the World. At this bold, and most impious way of writing, he may make another such golden Book, if he pleases, against the Jewish Church, and Priesthood, of which I do not doubt, but he hath the same worthy Thoughts, with his Master <sup>w</sup> Spinoza, as he hath of the Christian, viz. That, like the superstitious Institutions of Numa, they were both but pretended Revelations, and in reality the Invention of crafty, and designing Men. Nay at this rate he may write a serious Satyr against the natural Constitution of Man, and blasphemously charge his Creator with want of Wisdom, and Goodness in making a Creature subject to two such different and jarring Principles, and Powers as Flesh and Spirit, Sense and Reason, <sup>x</sup> whereof *the one is contrary to the other*, and whereby the unhappy Creature is <sup>y</sup> *at the same time*, as he speaks, *under different Obligations*, as when one commandeth him to go to Church, and the other to lye in Bed at home; or the one bids him keep a Day holy, and the other bids him work, or the one wou'd have him feast, and indulge his Genius, but the other wou'd have him fast.

But not to insist longer on the Impiety and Blasphemy of his Undertaking, wou'd you not think a Man mad, that wou'd write a Book in good earnest, to prove that there cannot be two such contrary Principles, and contending Powers in one and the same Creature? That the Doctrine of the ΤΟ ΗΓΗΜΟΝΙΚΟΝ, is an absurd, uncharitable Doctrine, which restrains Men from the Pleasures, for which they were born; that it hath caused infinite Vexation and Mischief to Mankind, and that it, and the

<sup>w</sup> See a Book entituled Spinoza revived. Printed and to be sold by John Morphew, 1709.

<sup>x</sup> Greg. Nazian. Orat. viii. Τὸ Σῶμα; ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα; οἷα ὅς τις πολλὰ ἀνιστολεμὲν ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις, καὶ ἀνισκαθίζεσθαι.

<sup>y</sup> The Rights, p. 33, 34, 35. Edit. 3.

Doctrines of Mortification, Self-denial, and Resignation to the Will of any God, are of Pagan Original, borrowed from Heathen Priests, and Philosophers, from the *Druids* in the *West*, or the *Brahmins*, and *Faquers* in the *East*, and that it sets the wretched Creature at Strife with himself; and, by its unnatural Severities, is utterly inconsistent with the Wisdom, and Goodness of God, and the true Happiness of Man?

Wou'd you not, I say, think a Man far gone in Frenzy, that shou'd set himself to write such a Book? And yet our Author is that Man, as King *David* was the rich Man in *Nathan's* Parable. For he hath written a Book against the Frame, and Constitution of the Church in all the parts of it, tho' it is as certain, that God was the Maker and Contriver of it, If the general Voice and Testimony of ancient Christianity is to be believed, as that he was the Creator of Man. I say, the general Voice of ancient Christianity; because Hereticks and Schismaticks, as well as Catholics, bore witness to that very Constitution of the Church against which he writes. When they disputed Matters of Doctrine, they never quarrell'd about the Episcopal Frame of Church-Government and Discipline; and though they were often divided into different Parties and Communions, yet they were all religious Observers of the same Church-Polity (except *Aerius* and his few Followers) which he attempts to subvert, because they all alike believed it to have been instituted by Christ.

But what need have I to appeal to the Testimony of Christianity? What need I produce *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Consent*, against an upstart, bold Writer, supported by no such Authority? The Testimonies of the early, and learned Saints and Martyrs, which I have cited above in the Margins of the vi<sup>th</sup>. vii<sup>th</sup> and viii<sup>th</sup> Pages, for the Constitution, Rights, and Powers of the Church, are abundantly sufficient without



out any other, to weigh down a thousand such Books, as this wretched Man, or Club of Men, hath written *in this Day of Trouble, Rebuke, and Blasphemy, to reproach God.* God whom he hath charged with Folly, in framing a Church-Polity for Christians, most absurd, and inconsistent with it self, and the very ends for which it was formed. Ten thousand such TEKELS's of modern Books, if weighed in the Balance, against Scripture, and Primitive Antiquity, will be found defective and wanting, but as a drop of a Bucket, or as a little Dust, plainly as nothing in the Judgment of serious Men, who will impartially compare them together.

The Deists, and Atheists of late, by this and other such Writers, have *exalted their Voices against the Lord*, and his Church; but, I hope, he hath heard their Words, and will reprove them, and in his appointed time make the *Virgin, the Daughter of Zion*, whom they despise and laugh to scorn, despise and shake her Head at them. It concerns all good Christians to distinguish themselves from them, and to resist them as they would the Devil, stedfastly in the Christian Faith; which it is their Design to destroy, if they could, in writing against the Priesthood, and the Church. For if they can once persuade Men, that Church Government, and Discipline is nothing but the Invention, and Craft of Priests, they will soon persuade them, that the Christian Doctrines are so too. And hence it is, that we have so many of their invective Pamphlets against making of Creeds, and *Creed-makers*, who impose upon Men Articles of Faith. These Men of *large Minds*, and *free Thoughts*, will not have them confined, and tyed up to Forms, and Summaries of Belief, but on they will go in the broad way of thinking, as well as living, out-doing the Devil in *Latitude*; the Devils, who as the Scripture tells us, are such narrow-soul'd Spirits, as to believe, and tremble. If they durst, they

they would write as publickly against Scripture-making, as you may perceive by the Table-talk, which the reputed Author of the *Rights*, and some other *Gracians* had of them, at a Dinner <sup>2</sup> the 29<sup>th</sup> of *November* last. There their Tongues were their own, and without any Restraint to the *Liberties of Mankind*, and the *Freedoms of human Nature*, they plentifully vented their Blasphemies upon the holy Writings, which nothing, but the good Intention of creating an Abhorrence of such Monsters of Unbelief and Blasphemy, can justifie the Recital of. They began with *Balaam* and his *Ass*, and with Scorn, and Scurrility enough, asserted the *Ass* to be the fittest of the two, to see an *Angel*, and to have *Divine Inspirations*, and *Revelations*. They said the *Books of the New Testament* were a long while kept private, till the Council of *Laodicea* fell to telling of *Noses*; in which their Malice exceeded that of *Julian*, who never questioned the Canon of the Holy Scriptures. *Hermas's Pastor* they despised, as the most silly Book that ever was cited for Scripture by the Ancients, with others of the same stamp. But these Scorners might have spoken with more Respect of an holy Author, whom God employ'd in so many Messages to his Church, and to whom he vouchsafed so many Revelations, and for whom so many of the Ancients, as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Irenaus*, had a great Reverence, even for the *Simplicity* of his Writings, though they were mistaken in the Authority of them: I need not mention *St. Athanasius*, nor the Learned Men of this Age, as *Cotelerius* and *Dr. Bernard*, who have adorn'd this Book with their Notes; nor *Du Pin*, nor *Tillemont*, nor *Dr. Wake* Bishop of *Lincoln*, who hath made the Apostolick Author speak pure, and proper English in a venerable Apostolick Stile. But these are a sort of human Race, who neither fear

---

<sup>2</sup> That is the 29<sup>th</sup> of *November* before the first Edition of this Book.  
God,

God, nor reverence Men, especially *Priests*, whose Office they hate, and their Persons for the sake of their Office. By *other Books of the same Stamp*, they particularly meant the Book of the Revelations, of which they said, *it had been well if it had been still kept private, for there had not been so many Madmen*; and then cited a Sentence of a Learned Divine against the Enthusiasts, who had abused it, as if he had said the same thing. Then they said, that *None of the Prophecies could be understood, for multitude of Interpretations, that if they were already fulfilled, we were no farther concerned with them, but if not, the Holy Ghost himself had need interpret them*. Then as for the Prophets, they did God, and them the Honour to compare them to the *Camisars*; and Prophecy to *Delirium in Fevers*; and told a Story of a Physician, who cured a Patient of his prophetic Deliriums, and was refused his Reward. They also said, *it was a Disease proper it may be to certain Places, and Constitutions, as Agues*; and took occasion, from a Passage in a Learned Author, to assert that *Wine was useful to prepare for the Illapses of the prophetic Spirit*; and thence observed, *that Drunkenness, and Prophecy was the same thing*. Behold here *Moses* and the Prophets, whose divine Authority our Blessed Lord owned, and himself with them, blasphemed into Drunkards, Madmen, or at best into Enthusiasts. Behold the Old Testament with the New, which is founded upon it, and bears witness to the Truth of it, made no better than the *Alcoran*, or *Notre-Dame's* Predictions, and by consequence the Jewish, and Christian Worthies, who believed those two sacred *Codes* to be the Oracles of God, and of Divine Inspiration, represented to be Men as credulous, and as much deluded, as the History of any Religion can shew. And then as for the *Miracles* mentioned in the Scriptures, they made many reflections upon them, which another Company of such Men, at a Publick House not far from

from *Somerset-House*, treated with the same Reverence, as these did the Scriptures. They exhausted *Spinoza* the Apostate Jew's Book, *des Ceremonies Superstitieuses des Juifs*. The passing over the Red Sea, they said, was not miraculous, but natural. By which they gave the Lye first to *Moses*, who tells us, That it was the blast of the Breath of God's Nostrils that gathered together the Waters of the Red Sea, and made them stand upright as an Heap: Secondly, to the Psalmist, who saith, It was God that divided it, and made Israel to pass through the midst of it; that he rebuked and dried it up, and made the People pass through the depth thereof, as through a Wilderness; And Lastly, to the Apostle, who tells us, That by Faith they passed through the Red Sea as by dry Land, which the Egyptians attempting to do were all drowned therein. The Pillar of Fire, they said, was some sort of artificial Preparation in the nature of a Phosphorus, though it is reckoned by *Moses* and in the Psalms among the Wonders which God did in the sight of their Fathers, when in the Day time he led them with a Cloud, and all the Night with a Light of Fire. *Elijah's Sacrifice*, they said, was by artificial Fire, and one of them, who was a Priest, and undoubtedly a Priest after their own Heart, said he could do the same. They reflected upon the Miracles, which our Saviour did more privately, as when he put all the People out of the Ruler of the Synagogues House, and raised his dead Daughter only before her Father and Mother, and a few of his Disciples. But to return from these to the Gentlemen at Dinner, and their reflections on the Scriptures; they said, There were many Contradictions in them, that the Holy Ghost could speak his own Mind plainly if he pleased, and therefore that 'tis the highest Blasphemy, and worthy of Death, for any to pretend, by their Explications of the

---

\* Deut. i. 33.



Text, to speak plainer than he, and to interpret the Mind of God, as if he were not able to tell his own meaning, and that all Priests were monstrously guilty of it, and that the Author of the Rights doth the very same thing as Christ and his Apostles did, in speaking against Priests. Lastly, That multitudes of Religions were as much for God's Honour as variety of Faces, and that God must have a mind to be so worshipped.

O blessed Table, which was sanctify'd with such Talk as this! Where they also said, That the Marriage in Cana was a merry meeting, and that He, meaning our Lord, made the Water Wine with Spirit of Wine. And that the one thing needful, of which he spake to Martha, was a good Dish of Meat! O blessed Family, which must hear such Table-talk, as blasphem'd the Scriptures into Contradictions, and reproach'd the Holy Spirit with not speaking plainly, because in some places he was pleased to wrap up his meaning in Figures, and Similitudes, and Parables, as in the Prophetical Books, and other Passages of Scripture; and because his plain meaning in other places accidentally became obscure, like the meaning of old human Authors, for want of knowing the ancient Histories, Customs, Proverbs, and Idioms of Speech, which are requisite to make them be understood. How few among us understand the Books that were written by our Ancestors, but two or three hundred Years ago? Which however are plain to those, who understand the ancient Saxon, and Norman-Saxon Tongue. How many dark and difficult places of Scripture have of late been made plain to Demonstration, by Nic. Fuller, Mede, Lightfoot, and Pocock, and other learned Men? But these Bravos, because they hate the Scriptures, and because Priests for the most part are, and have been Expositors of them, damn all Expositions, and sentence the Expounders, and by consequence all the Translators, and Paraphrasts of them to death. A modest, and merciful

Sentence! In which is involv'd the lxxii Interpreters of the Old Testament into Greek, the Chaldee Paraphrasts, and not to mention our Blessed Lord, who is not excepted from it, the Apostles, *whose understandings be opened, that they should understand the Scriptures*, and with them again the Apostolick Writers, who expounded, and apply'd several Passages of the Old Testament to Christ, and his Church under the New, as St. Clement, St. Barnabas, and the Bishops, who expounded the Prophecies to *Constantin*, and St. Hermas whom they despise, and hate; because he speaks so much, and so plainly, against Sensuality, and Voluptuousness, and in preference of one of the two opposite Principles, and Desires in Man to the other, which they love much better, and like the Dunghil-cock in the Fable, which prefer'd the Corn of Barley before the Pearl, they value much more. And then, as for the New Testament, this meek Sentence also hangs up all the ancient Fathers without Mercy, who have rescued the Sense of Holy Writ, even of the Old as well as New Testament, from the perverse Interpretations of Jews, and Hereticks, and likewise all the Translators of the latter, both ancient and modern, into the Eastern, or Western Languages of the Christian World, with all the Commentators, and Criticks: Nay their dear Fathers, *Hobbes*, *Selden*, and *Spinoza*, and the Author of the *Rights* himself are included in their general Doom, with all the Unitarians, who have given the World new Explications of Scripture in opposition to the old *Nicene* Creed-makers, tho' I suppose they did not mean *Those*. This Censure also highly reflects upon our Lord, who bid the Jews search the Scriptures, who appeal'd to *Moses* and the Prophets, and bid them observe, and do whatsoever the *Expositors* of their Law, who sat in

*by Luke xxiv. 45.*

*Moses's*

*Moses's* Chair, bid them observe. It condemns the *Bereans* for searching the Scriptures, and *Timothy* for reading of them from a Child, by which he became a Christian; and plainly shews how much these Deists, and Atheists are griev'd that the Scriptures are translated, and expounded to maintain revealed Religion against them, and that there is yet an Order of Men, a pestilent Order of Priests, to read, and expound the Scriptures to the People, for which they deserve to be put to death.

These are the Men, the worthy Men, who hate Priests, and Priesthood; and for my own part, I think it a great Honour that our Order, and Persons for the Sake of our Order, have them, and the Devil, who walks about roaring in them, against the Priesthood, for our utter Enemies. They are as mad against us, as King *Philip* of *Macedon*, was against the Orators of *Athens*, because they defended the People; they rail against the Shepherds, because they would devour the Flock, and because the Revenues, upon which the Clergy live, would be very convenient for them; they therefore also represent Priesthood, as *Priest-craft* to the People, and all Christian Priests from the beginning without any Exception, as Cheats, and Knaves. Cheats, who, at first made the Scriptures, and have ever since expounded them: Cheats, and Usurpers, who have assumed to themselves an Authority over the People in the Name of God, and Christ, whom these dare blaspheme, as much in private, as they reproach his Ministers in publick; witness the beginning of his Miracles in *Cana*, which though the Evangelist saith, he did to manifest forth his Glory; yet according to their blasphemous Talk, it was no Miracle, but an artful Trick to deceive the People; and if it were so indeed, then all his other Miracles from this sham-beginning to the end, must have been such, so alike are the Ma-

lice, and Blasphemies, by *Beelzebub*, and by *Spirit of Wine*.

‘ The Liberty these men have already taken is astonishing, and would not be suffered in any other Christian Country, and a little more Forbearance, and Impunity <sup>d</sup> will make them presume more, and sport themselves in boldness, and blasphemy still more, and at length Crucify their Redeemer as often, and as impudently in publick, as they do with Jewish Malice in private. As they have treated him in his Priests, so if let alone, they will in a little time treat him in his Offices, and Person, and put him to open Shame in the same Names. If in the first part of the RIGHTS they have so abused those of his Household, may we not expect in the second, that they will abuse the Master of the House. One of them not long ago told a worthy Gentleman, who upon Christian Principles hath a Reverence for the Clergy, he would shew him what Priests, and Priesthood were, and then turning to SABINI in *Festus Pompeius*, shew’d him these words, Sabini a Cultura Deorum dicti, id est, *ὅτι τῶ σέβει.* Sabini quod volunt somniant, vetus proverbium esse, & inde manasse ait Sinnius Capito, quod quotiescunque sacrificium propter viam fieret, hominem Sabinum ad illud adhibere solebant: Nam his promittebat se pro eis somniaturum, Idemque postquam evigilasset Sacra facientibus narrabat omne quidquid in quiete vidisset, quod quidem esset ex sacrificii Religione. Unde venisse videtur in proverbium, Sabinos solitos quod velent somniare, sed quia propter aviditatem bibendi

---

‘ See *The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity*, with the Preface to the *Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England*, and the excellent weekly Paper called the *Rehearsal*.

<sup>d</sup> Witness *The Letter of Enthusiasm to a Lord*. *Sensus Communis*. *Sililoquy*, or Advice to an Author. *Priest-craft in Perfection*, and *A Detection of the true meaning and wicked design of a Book entituled*, *A pain and easy method with the Deists*.



*quedam anus mulieres id somnium captabant, vulgatum est illud quoque, anus quod vult somniat. Fere enim quod vigilantes animo volvimus, id dormientibus patere solet.* In English this means no more, nor less, than their common Blasphemy, *that all Religions, and Priests of all Religions are the same.* And two of them, whom I could name, after much blasphemous Discourse in a Lady's House, left a Paper of Reasons with her, to persuade her Ladyship, why she should not believe in Christ, calling God the Son by such a Name of Contempt, as I abhor to mention, much exceeding the Malice of *Julian*, who after his Apostacy never called him by any Name more opprobrious, than the *GALILÆAN*; and the *Galilæan*, I hope, in his appointed time will make them to their own Confusion, and his Honour say, *vicisti Galilæe.* Thus these *Giants* make War with Heaven, and as they endeavour with the Power of Hell to pull the Priesthood from the Church, so *Lucifer*-like, if they could, they would pull the Church from Christ, Christ from the Right-hand of God, and God out of his Throne. Indeed *Julian*, if compared with these Men, was a Person of Moderation, Principles, and Piety; for he was serious in the Religion of their Ancestors, as he told the Heathens, and in the Worship of the *Gods*; and tho' he was by Temper a Satyrist, and had more Wit, and human Learning than *Gabal* and *Ammon* and *Amalek*; than *A.* and *C.* and *St.* and *T. T. T.* and all the execrable Clubs of Atheists and Deists in the Town, yet he never reviled the Christian Church, and Priesthood, as these new Apostates do. He never questioned the Authority of the Scriptures, of which he had been Reader, nor charged the Christians with *keeping them private, till the Council of Laodicea fell a telling Noses*; he knew the Doctrines of the Christian Sect, and their Confessions of Faith, but he never charged the Christians with inventing their Creeds, or im-

posing Articles of Faith upon the People, because he knew the *Nicene* Fathers, as Witnesses only of the Christian Faith, gave in their Evidences upon diligent, and impartial Search of what they found to be the Doctrine of the Church, in the Writings of their Predecessors from the time of the Apostles to their own time. Of all the Christians, or Christian Priests, and Bishops, *Julian* express'd most Hatred against *St. Athanasius*. \* He called him, *contemprible Fellow*, *abominable*, *Enemy of the Gods*, *wicked Man*, *crafty Fellow*, *impudent*, and such like Names, but he never called him *Sathanasius*, or *Creed-making Rascal*, as our Philistines do, who are sworn together against the Priesthood of Christ, and his Ministers, and fight, I trust, in vain against him, and the Christian Faith. But more particularly, as to the common Office of a Priest in all Religions, and the common Notion of Priesthood among all Mankind, he was so far from calling, or thinking it *Priest-Craft*, that he spoke of it, and of Priests with the greatest Honour, and Veneration, as the *Ministers* of the Gods, and *Mediators*, and Intercessors with them for Men. And therefore he magnify'd his Office as *chief Pontiff*, and seems to value himself, as much upon the account of it, as of the Imperial Crown. † In relation to the Gods, saith he, *I am Sovereign Pontiff*, though not at all worthy of that great Honour. But I endeavour to make my self worthy of it, by daily Prayers unto the Gods: ‡ And it is agreeable to right Reason, saith he, to honour Priests, as the Liturges, and Servants of Gods, who minister to us <sup>b</sup> in things pertaining to the Gods, and have great Power in bringing down their Blessings upon us. For they sacrifice and pray for all, and therefore it is right to give as much,

\* Epist. vi. li. Ed. Paris. MDCXXX.

† Fragment. Orat. p. 546.

‡ Ibid. p. 541.

<sup>b</sup> Δρακονόρας ἡμῶν τὰ θεῶν τῶν Θεῶν.

or rather more Honour to them, than the Civil <sup>1</sup> Magistrates. But if any one think that both are to be equally honoured, because the Civil Magistrates, as Guardians of the Law, are in some sort Priests, yet we ought to shew greater respect to those, after the Example of the Græcians <sup>2</sup>, who persuaded their angry King to reverence a Priest, as such, tho' he was their Enemy; and therefore shall we not honour Priests, who are our Friends, and pray and sacrifice for us? — For as long as any Man is a Priest, he is to be honoured and venerated; but if he is wicked, he is to be deprived of the Priesthood, and rejected as unworthy; but as long as he is employ'd in Divine Offices, and Ministry to the Gods, he is to be regarded with Veneration, and Religious Honour, as the most excellent thing that belongs to the Gods. — Therefore, as the Magistrate, so is the Priest honourable, according to the Didymæan Oracle of Jove, which threatens Destruction to all wicked Men, who affront the Gods in dishonouring their Priests.

In these places, and others, where he compares the Priest with the Civil Magistrate, he plainly speaks of the Sacerdotal, as distinct from, and independent of the Secular Power; and therefore, as Chief Pontiff, he wrote a Letter to <sup>3</sup> Arsacius the Chief Priest of Galatia, to direct him, how he should behave himself suitably to his Character, particularly in admonishing and reproving the inferior Priests, who neglected their Duty, or transgress'd it, as by going to Theatres, or Taverns, &c. and to deprive them, when they were incorrigible. He warned them to invite the great Secular Officers, and Magistrates seldom to his House, but to write often to them; and when any of them made their Entrance into the City, to let no Priest meet them at the Gate, but

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ τοῖς Πολιτικοῖς Ἀρχαῖσι. See the second Letter.

<sup>2</sup> See §. xi. of the first Letter.

<sup>3</sup> Ἀρσακίῳ Ἀρχιερεῖ, Γαλατίας.

when they came to the Temples to meet them at the Porch, and to let no Officers go in before them, because they came to the Temple<sup>m</sup> as other People, to worship in their private Capacity, and because the Priest was superior in the Temple to all that came, according to the Law of the Gods. To which whosoever are obedient, are truly religious; but those who are disobedient through Arrogance, are proud, and vain-glorious Persons. As Chief Pontiff also he<sup>n</sup> suspended a Priest, for beating another Priest. Wherefore, saith he, seeing I am, according to the Rites of the Religion of our Fathers, Sovereign Pontiff, and Chief Priest of Apollo Didymæus, I forbid you for three whole Months not to do any thing that belongs to the Office of a Priest. But if in the meantime you behave your self well, and seem worthy, and the Chief Priests of the City shall write to me to certify me thereof, I shall then consult the Gods, whether I shall restore you. This Punishment I inflict upon you for your Folly, and Presumption. — But I will beg of the Gods, that upon your Prayers to them, you may obtain Pardon for your Fault.

Julian was a serious Pagan in his Religion, and led a philosophical, austere Life in Temperance, Continnence, and Self-denial, and I have cited these things out of his Works concerning the common Notion of Priests, and Priesthood; to confirm what I have written of them in the first Letter, and for a Testimony against our utter Despisers, and Shameless Revilers of them, especially in the Rights of the Christian Church. But Julian shall rise up in Judgment against them, and it shall be more tolerable for him in the Day of Judgment than for them, who crucify Christ afresh in the Christian Priesthood, and put him to open Shame, in calling it Priestcraft. For the same Reasons have I taken notice of the Distinction he made between the Sacerdotal, and Civil

<sup>m</sup> Ως ιδιώτης.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. lxii.



Power, and of his own different Capacities, as an *Emperor*, and a *Priest*. Indeed both Powers were united in him, but then his exercising Sacerdotal Power, and Jurisdiction as Chief Priest, when he did not act as Emperor, shews that the Sacerdotal is different from the Imperial Power, and that they may be in different Subjects, as well as in one. This Testimony of *Julian* about the Dignity of the Sacerdotal Office, and of its being of a distinct Nature from the Imperial, agrees with my *second* Letter, which shews, that they were actually separated from one another, and actually belonged to different Persons of different Characters, and Commissions in the Christian Roman Empire. For as all Mankind, of what Nation or Religion soever, by the Light of common Reason, agreed in the Notions of a Deity, of Divine Worship, of Temples, and Altars : So by the same common Light of Reason they all agreed in the Notion of the Priesthood, and of the difference between the Sacred, and Civil Power ; and this Argument, from the common Notion and Consent of Mankind, is of such force, that these Sons of *Belial*, and Blasphemy, have no way to avoid it, but by saying, That Priests of all Nations and Religions are, and have been alike, all Cheats, and Knaves, all Deceivers of the People ; and that Priesthood, and all the pretended Powers of it, is nothing but *Priestcraft*, and by consequence so must the common Notion of a God, of Divine Worship, and of Temples, and Altars be. But why do I say by Consequence, when they boldly assert it ? And though the Author of the *Rights* dares not yet speak so plain of the common Notion of a God, and of Divine Worship, yet he saith it in Consequence, by calling Priesthood in common Priestcraft, ° and asserting, that the Christian Priests borrow'd the Custom of

excluding Men from the holy Communion, and of Excommunication from the Heathen Priests, particularly from the *Druids*, who by excluding from Sacrifice whom they pleased, got all Power into their Hands. He might as well, had he pleased, have asserted, that they borrowed the Notion of a God, and the Custom of Divine Worship, and the Institution of Priesthood it self, and the Doctrine of Christ's Mediation, and of the other World from them, as the *History of Religion* most blasphemously in too plain Intimations affirms. Nay, had he pleased, he might have said, they borrow'd it from the *Mexican*, or other *American* Priests, before the *Spaniards* conquer'd the *West-Indies*; or have asserted with his usual assurance, that *Moses* borrowed the Invention of the Ark of the Covenant from them; for we are assured by those, who have written Accounts of those barbarous People, that the Devil, the *Ape* of the great God, led them about with an *Ark*.

I have said thus much about this *Synagogue of Libertines*, the true Synagogue of Satan among us, to shew those, who are not yet acquainted with their Doctrine, and Manners, what kind of Men they are, who have this infernal Spite at Priesthood, which derives it self from God, and at the Dignity, Discipline, and Authority of the Sacerdotal Order, which they are permitted to tell the World in *broad English*, is nothing but Usurpation, and by consequence, that not only the Christian and Jewish, but the Patriarchal Priesthood, hath been all along pure Cheat: And that *Melchisedeck* himself, whom the Scripture calls *Priest of the most High God*, *Melchisedeck* the Type of our Saviour, in his Sacerdotal and Regal Office, *Melchisedeck* to whom the Father of the Faithful paid Tithes, and from whom he receiv'd his *Sacerdotal* Blessing, as the less from the greater, that this great High Priest was no better than the rest, a mere Priestcraft Villain,

and

and Knave. I would to God our Temporal Governours, to whose Consciences I now speak, would appoint a Committee to examine their Works, particularly, *The Rights of the Christian Church*, and if they find they write Truth and Reason, then to depose the whole Order of Priesthood, as *Tiberius* did that of the *Druids* among the *Celts*: For if it be but *Priestcraft*, it is intolerable in Humane Societies; or let them slay us, if they please, as *Jehu* did the Priests of *Baal*; or set the People, whom we have deluded to such a degree, in one general Massacre upon us. For if we continue the same usurped Spiritual Authority over them, by the same Knaveish Craft, whereby, these Men say, it was at first obtain'd, we deserve no better Usage from their Hands, but if quite otherwise they find their Books, particularly this of *The Rights*, to be full of Falshood, Impudence, and Blasphemy, then let them animadvert upon them, and their Authors, be it in the gentlest manner they think they would be treated in any other Christian Nation of the World.

I am not insensible, what I have written in the following Letters about the Christian Priesthood, and its Sacrifice, and of the powerful Intercession of Priests with God, especially in the Holy Eucharist, may at first sight, amuse, and startle not only many of the Laity, who have not been conversant in these Theories, but even some of the Clergy, of whom I may say, I hope without Offence, as *Ger. Vossius* did of *Keckerman*, that they are *Viri cateroquin Eruditi, sed novellorum Scriptorum, quam Antiquitatis Studiosiores*. And therefore, though I think I have said nothing on these Subjects, but what I have proved by the concurrent Testimonies of the best ancient Christian Writers, yet the better to prepare such Readers for my Book, I beg leave to add some

more both ancient and modern Authorities, which in a crowd of Thoughts escaped my notice, and which will farther shew, that I have advanced nothing but what is Catholick Doctrine, being far from Affectation of Singularities, or Novelties, which are dangerous in Divinity, and generally serve to no end, be the Authors of them never so learned, but to gratifie the common Enemies of Revealed Religion, who are apt to make very ill use and advantage of them.

I begin with Gregory Nazianzen, who in his XXX<sup>d</sup> Oration speaks of Moses, as a Priest, thus, *He by the secret and mystical Figure, in which he put his hands, turn'd the Amalekites to flight; for the hands of a Priest held up on the Mountain in Prayer, did what many thousands of Men could not do.* And then turning his Oration to Anthimus Tyanensis, or some other factious intruding Bishop, who made use of Military Force, saith he, *What canst thou say, O Son of Dathan and Abiram, and maddest of Captains, who durst rise up against Moses, who hast lift up thy hands against us, as they did against that great Servant of God? How, wast thou not afraid? wast thou not ashamed to do so? and didst thou not sink into the ground? — How couldst thou, after this, lift up these Hands to God, and offer with them to him, and intercede for the People?* And in his XVII<sup>b</sup> Oration, speaking to the angry Governour of Nazianzum, who was offended at the People: Saith he, *What, Sir, would you have my Father offer his hoary Hairs, and his great number of Tears, and his long unblemished Priesthood to you, to appease you; his unblemished Priesthood, which perhaps the holy Angels, the Servants of the most Holy God, reverence as much as their own Ministry? Have I now said enough to soften you? or shall I say something more boldly? For Grief makes me very bold. I now then offer you Christ, Christ who was humbled for us; the Passion,*  
and



in Answer to The Rights, &c. xxix

and Cross of Christ, who yet was impassible, the Nails by which I am absolved from Sin, his Blood, his Burial, his Resurrection, and Ascension, and this Table, of which we now communicate, and the Symbols of my Salvation, which I consecrate with the same Mouth, with which I now make Intercession to thee: I say, I now present unto thee this most holy Mystery, which exalts us unto Heaven. And in his third Oration, which is against Julian, with whom he had studied at Athens, saith he of him, He defiled his Baptism with the impure and abominable Blood of initiatory Sacrifices, returning, as it is in the Proverb, like a Sow to the wallowing in the Mire; and polluted his hands in cleansing and purging of them of the unbloody Sacrifices, by which we communicate with Christ, and his Sufferings, and his Godhead. And in his first Oration giving a Reason of his unwillingness to be made a Bishop before he had prepared himself, saith he, Knowing these things, and that no Man is worthy of the great God, Sacrifice, and High Priest, who hath not first presented himself a living, and holy Sacrifice to God, or not testified his reasonable well-pleasing Service, or not sacrificed to God the Sacrifice of Praise, and a contrite Heart, (which is the <sup>a</sup> only Sacrifice the Giver of all

---

<sup>a</sup> Here it is to be observed that Terms of Exception in all Languages are not always to be taken in an exclusive, but sometimes in a comparative sense, as only denoting the things signified by the Nouns to which they are joined to be the chief, or most eminent, and excellent of their kind. So when the Father here saith that the Sacrifice of a contrite heart, is the ONLY Sacrifice God requires, he means the chief, and most excellent Sacrifice, without which no other Sacrifice is acceptable to him. So if a Man should say, God only is good, or in our Saviour's Phrase, None is good but one, that is God, he must be understood in the comparative sense, viz. that in comparison to God none is good, because he is supereminently, infinitely, and essentially good. Such is that in the Greek Prayers, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, ὁ Μόνος Ἁγίος, O Lord God, who only art holy. The like is to be observed of Phrases, as well as terms of Exception: as where St. Paul said, I determined not to know any thing among

all things requires of us) how durst I presume to offer up unto him, that external Figure of the great Mysteries [of the Body, and Blood of Christ,] or how could I take upon me the Name, and Habit of a Bishop, before I had purified my Hands with holy Works? In this Passage it is observable, how the Holy Father distinguishes the private, or personal Sacrifice by which a Christian Man prepares himself for the Priestly Office, and the publick Sacrifice, which he is to offer; when he is made a Priest. The former he metaphorically calls a living, holy, and acceptable, and his reasonable Service in allusion to the Apostle, Rom. xii. 1. *I beseech you, Brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God; which is your reasonable service.* But then the other publick Sacrifice, which a Priest so prepared, is only worthy to offer is ἡ ἑξωθεν ἡ τῶν μετὰ τὸν μυστήριον Ἀντίτυπον, that external Sacrifice, or Oblation, which is the Figure, or Representation of the great Mysteries, i. e. of the Mysteries of the Body of Christ, which was crucified, and of his Blood, which was shed for the Redemption of the World. This Figure, or Representation of the dead Body, and effused Blood of Christ he elsewhere calls in the

---

among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified, he meant not to exclude Christ's Resurrection, and Ascension, &c. as the Father here in saying that the internal Sacrifice of a contrite heart was the ONLY Sacrifice, which God requires, meant not to exclude the external Oblation or Sacrifice of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, as appears from the Passage it self, and from another to the same purpose, Orat. xxix. de Constitutione Episcoporum. ταῦτα ὅν ἐστὶν Ἐσώ, καὶ ὅτι, &c. I therefore knowing these things, and that no Man is worthy of God, and the Sacrifice, and to be a chief Priest (i. e. a Bishop), who hath not first presented himself a living Sacrifice to God, or rather is not first become the Temple of the living God.

See Orat. XI. Pag. 187.

Orat. III. adversus Julian. p. 70. Τὸς ἀναμάρτητος θυσιᾶς, δι' ἡμῶν χεῖρ' αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντος.

Style

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* xxxi

Style of the Church, the *unbloody Sacrifice*, by which we communicate, or have Communion with Christ. These latter Words he said, after he shewed how unreasonable it was for any Man to ascend to the Episcopat in haste; *Who would*, saith he, *make a Defender of the Gospel, that is to stand before God with Angels, and glorifie him with Archangels, and whose Office it is to transmit Sacrifices upward to the Altar above, and execute the Priests Office with Christ, who would make such an one, as they form a Statue of Clay, in a Day.* And in the beginning of his Letter to Simplicia, he applies this part of the Character of a Bishop, of being Priests with Christ, to Basil the great Bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia: Saith he, *In this you do well, that you have commanded that our holy and common Father, that Pillar of the Faith, that Rule of Truth, and that hoary Pattern of a Church full of Wisdom, who surpassed the common measure of human Life, and Vertue, that great High Priest, and Mediator between God and Man, who was the Mansion of the Holy Spirit.* So in his xv<sup>th</sup> Iambick, Tom. ii. p. 201. Ἱερουργὼν ὃ ἀγνισμὸς φερον, Θεῷ φερον ἀνθρωπον, ἀνθρωπῷ Θεον, *Mentes Sacerdotium purgat, & Sanctas facit Hominem Deoque copulans, Homini & Deum.* So the Latin: *the Priesthood purifies the minds of Men, bringing together Man to God, and God to Man.* To which I may add two of his Verses is his XI<sup>th</sup> Poem to the Bishops:

ὦ Θυσίας πῆμπόντες ἀναμάρτες ἱερεῖς

ὦ Δεὸν ἀνθρώποισι, μετ' ἔσχατον, εἰς ἐν ἄγοντες.

*O you Priests, who offer up unbloody Sacrifices, and,  
O your great Dignity! who reconcile Men to God.*

---

\* Καὶ Χειρῶν ἑνωσθῆναι. So Σωφρογῆτες, 2 Cor. vi. 1.  
So Θεὸς ᾧ ἑσθῶν ἑνωσθῆναι, 1 Cor. iii. 9.

So his Father " *Greg. Nyssen.* Nam si is, qui ad expiandum populum delectus est, indiget ipse expiatione, quid fiet illi, qui ejusmodi munus non sustinet: for if he who is chosen to make Atonement for the People, needs Atonement himself, what can become of such an one, who doth not sustain his Function?

In these Citations we have the Priests, the unbloody Sacrifice, the Atonement, and Expiation they make by it in virtue of the bloody propitiatory Sacrifice which is commemorated and represented by it, and the great Dignity, and Excellency of the sacerdotal Office, which by presenting this Sacrifice to God upon Earth in Union with the other, that Christ presents unto him in Heaven, reconciles God to Men. This was the ancient Christian Divinity, and it is the Summary, and Design of my first Letter, and the Clergy will never have the just Reverence, they ought to have for their own Character, nor the People that Respect, they should have for their Persons, till these Truths are openly professed in the Church. " *Jesus Christ*, saith St. Cyprian, was the Author, and Institutor of this Sacrifice. And our Lord after Supper offered up the Cup of Wine mix'd with Water, and if we are the Priests of God, and Christ, I cannot tell, whom we should rather follow than God and Christ. And \* who was more the Priest of the most high God, than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered Sacrifice to the Father, and offered the very same Sacrifice that Melchisedech offered, that is, Bread, and Wine, to wit, his Body and Blood. ' So, in which

---

" *Ad eos qui durus, & acerbissimus judicant*, p. 967.

" *Epist. LXIII. ad Cecil.* Jesus Christus Dominus, & Deus noster sacrificii hujus auctor, & Doctor, p. 148.

\* *Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei Summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus? Qui Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedech, id est, panem, & vinum suum scilicet corpus & sanguinem*, p. 149.

' *Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse, quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse, quod sanguinem suum dixit*, p. 152.



part, we find the Cup to have been mix'd which the Lord offered, and that to have been the Wine, which he called his Blood.

<sup>2</sup> And if Jesus Christ our Lord, and God is the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered himself to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of himself, then that Priest is truly his Vicegerent, who imitates, what Christ did. To these let me add the other Authorities of this Father, as those in his first Epistle, where he declares, that they, who were honoured with the Priesthood (which then was esteemed a great Honour) and ordained to the clerical Office, and Ministry, ought not to serve but at the Altar, and Sacrifices, and give themselves to Supplication, and Prayers — as God appointed the Levites to do, who were never to be called off from their Ministry, nor to recede from the Altar, and Sacrifices, but night and day to attend in their spiritual Employment. Which (saith he) our pious Ancestors considering, judged that none of the dying Brethren should appoint a Clergy-man Curator of his Will, and that if any did so, <sup>a</sup> no Oblation should be made for him, nor Sacrifice solemnized for his Repose. For he doth not deserve to be named at the Altar in the Prayers of the Priests, who would call off the Priests from the Altar. So in his fifth Epistle, when he cautions that they should not visit the Martyrs, and Confessors in too great numbers, saith he, <sup>b</sup> consider and take care how this may be done more discreetly, and safely: I advise that the Presbyters,

<sup>2</sup> Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus, & Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei patris, & sacrificium patri seipsum primus obtulit & hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur, p. 155.

<sup>a</sup> Non offeretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Neque enim apud Altare Dei meretur nominari in Sacerdotum prece, qui ab Altari Sacerdotes, & ministros voluit avocare.

<sup>b</sup> Ita ut presbyteri quoque qui illic offerunt.

who offer, [that is administer the Eucharist] where the Confessors are imprisoned, go thither severally with their several Deacons, and that by turns, because change of Persons is of great use to prevent the invidious observation of those who meet together. So in his XVII<sup>th</sup> Epistle. Notwithstanding I hear that some of the Presbyters — have already begun to communicate with Lapsers, and offer [at the Altar] for them, and give them the Eucharist, &c. So in Epistle LVII. on the contrary it is our great Glory to have given the Peace to the Martyrs, as Priests who daily celebrate Sacrifices to God, and prepare a Host<sup>a</sup> for those, who are to conflict with the Enemy, and Victims for them, who overcome him. So in Epistle LXIII. Si vinum tantum quis offerat, if any offer wine only, &c. So in Epistle LXV. Quando nec oblatio sanctificari illic possit, ubi Spiritus Sanctus non sit, seeing the Oblation cannot be sanctified there where the Holy Spirit is not. This was said against Fortunatianus, who after he had sacrificed to Idols, would nevertheless act as a Bishop, as if he had never lapsed, which gave occasion to express himself against him in the follow-

<sup>a</sup> Jam cum lapsis communicare cepisse, & offerre pro illis, & Eucharistiam dare.

<sup>a</sup> Episcopatus nostri honor grandis & gloria est pacem dedisse Martyribus ut Sacerdotes, qui Deo quotidie celebramus HOSTIAS Deo, & VICTIMAS præparemus. Why I have paraphrased Hosts, and Victims as I have done, may be seen from Isidore, Lib. xvi. cap. 19. Hostia dicuntur sacrificia, quæ ab his fiunt qui in hostem pergunt, victimæ sacrificia, quæ post victoriam fiunt. And so Servilius in Lib. i. Eo. This distinction of the Eucharistical Oblation, before, and after the Conflict by Hostia and Victima is evident from this Epistle; At vero nunc non infirmis sed fortibus pax necessaria est nec morientibus sed viventibus communicatio a nobis danda est, ut quos excitamus & hortamur ad prælium non inermes, & nudos relinquamus, sub protectione Sanguinis, & Corporis Christi muniamus, & cum ad hoc fiat Eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela — Nam quomodo docemus, aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere si eis militatibus Christi sanguinem denegamus, &c.

ing manner: "I was grieved that he should pretend to act as a Priest, who had betrayed the Priesthood, as if it were lawful for a Priest, to come to God's Altar, who had offered at the Altar of the Devil. So how can he think, he can officiate as a Priest of God, who obey'd the Priests of the Devil, or how can he be worthy to offer the Sacrifice of God, and our Lord's Prayer with a sacrilegious, and criminal Hand, seeing God in the Scriptures hath forbidden Priests to sacrifice for lesser Crimes. So in Epistle LXVII. which is a Synodical Determination of the African Bishops in the Case of Basilides and Martialis, two Spanish Bishops, who were Libellaricks, the Fathers speak, as followeth: *When we met together we read your Letters, in which you signified to us, that your Bishops Basilides, and Martialis had defiled themselves with taking out Certificates, that they sacrificed to Idols, and you desired our Opinion in the Case; but it is not so much from our determination, as from the divine Commandments, that we send an answer, for it hath long since been declared by a voice from Heaven, and determined by the Law of God, who, and what kind of men ought to serve at the Altar, and offer Sacrifice to God, for in Exodus, &c, we ought therefore to set these things before our eyes, and seriously, and religiously to consider them, that we may choose, and ordain none for Bishops, but Men of unblemished Conversions; qui sancte, & digne sacrificia Deo offerentes, who halily, and worthily offering the Sacrifices to God; may be heard in the Prayers, which they make for the People. I cannot but take notice here how exactly this Father's Phrase, Sancte, & digne Sacrificia Deo offerentes, answers to that of*

<sup>a</sup> Audis sibi adhuc Sacerdotium quod prodidit vindicare; quasi post ARAS diaboli, accedere ad ALTARE Dei fas sit.

<sup>b</sup> Aut quomodo poterat manum suam transferri posse ad Dei Sacrificium, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Quos & quales oporteat deservire Altari, & Sacrificia Divina celebrare.

xxxvi *A Prefatory Discourse*

St. Clement, Epist. I. §. xlv. Τὸς ἀμέμπτως, καὶ ὁσίως  
 προσεβήσαντας τὰ ὅσια, in the Latin Version of  
 Junius, *qui sancte, & sine reprehensione offerunt mu-*  
*nera*, nor can I imagine for what reason the Right  
 Reverend Dr. Wake Bishop of Lincoln should tran-  
 slate them otherwise in the following Period: for it  
 would be no small sin in us, should we cast off those  
 from their Ministry, who holily, and without blame,  
 fulfilled the Duties of it. I confess he puts *offer*  
*the Gifts* in the Margin; but why his Lordship  
 put the true, and common Version in the Mar-  
 gin, and one so different from it in the Text,  
 he can best tell. But to return to the Synodical  
 Epistle of the African Bishops, they afterwards speak  
 thus: And seeing there are many other grievous Crimes  
 of which Basilides, and Martialis are guilty, in vain  
 do they pretend to re-enter upon their Episcopal Of-  
 fice, seeing it is evident that such Men cannot preside  
 over the Church of Christ, nor ought to offer Sacrifices to  
 God. So in his LXXV Epistle, Firmilian speaking  
 of the Woman possessed by the Devil, who admini-  
 stred the Holy Eucharist, she presumed (saith he) to  
 consecrate the Bread, and administer the Eucharist by  
 the usual <sup>b</sup> Invocation, and offer Sacrifice to the Lord  
 in the accustomed solemn Form. So in Epistle LXXXVI.  
 But in this Distress (saith the Father) there is no great  
 danger like to come to our Religion, because the Priests  
 of God cannot offer, and celebrate the Divine Sacrifices,  
 which in the next words he distinguishes from the  
 metaphorical Sacrifice of an humble, and contrite  
 Heart: *Sacrificium Deo Spiritus contribulatus, cor con-*  
*tritum, & humiliatum* — *hoc Sacrificium sine inter-*  
*missione die, ac nocte celebratis, hostia facta Deo, &*  
*vosmet ipsos sanctas atque immaculatas victimas offeren-*  
*tes, &c.* I have observed before how Gregory Na-  
 zianzen made the same distinction between the pro-

<sup>b</sup> Invocatione non cont. m<sup>is</sup>tibili.



*in Answer to The Rights, &c. xxxvii*

per, material, external Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, by Bread and Wine, and the metaphorical Sacrifice of a contrite Heart, and as I have faithfully rendred these Passages out of St. *Cyprian*: So I desire the impartial Reader to revise them, and to consider, if they are to be understood in a metaphorical sense. Was the Cup, which, he saith, our Lord offered up after Supper a metaphorical Oblation? Were the Oblations of Bread, and Wine which rich, and poor offered metaphorical Oblations? Was the very same Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine in the Holy Eucharist, which *Melchisedech* offered a metaphorical Sacrifice? And when he speaks of *Presbyteri qui offerunt*, and of such, *quos oporteat deservire Altari*, did he not believe Christian Presbyters to be offering, sacrificing, and *Altar-Priests*?

To the modern Testimonies I have cited for this Doctrine in my *first* Letter, I beg leave to add two, or three more out of the Writings of our learned Divines, who have wrote of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as of a Sacrifice, altogether as plainly as I have done. Dr. *Dan. Brevint*, late Dean of *Lincoln*, in his excellent <sup>1</sup> little Book entituled *The Christian Sacrament, and Sacrifice*, to use his own Words, <sup>2</sup> *hath endeavoured as he speaks, to set this H. Sacrament at Liberty, without regard to Papists, or Protestants, and rescue it out of the Hands of such, as have not treated rightly of it, and to restore it to the full Meaning, and Institution of Christ.* He observes <sup>1</sup> that as the Primitive Hereticks, whom the Spirit of Antichrist set up, endeavoured to destroy the natural Body, which is the human Nature of Christ: So his Sacramental Body hath not received much better Entertainment from two contrary Parties, who make it either a false

---

<sup>1</sup> Printed in 12<sup>o</sup> at the Theater in Oxford 1673.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. Dedicat.

<sup>1</sup> Pag. 2.

xxxviii *A Prefatory Discourse*

God, or an empty Ceremony. I forbear to transcribe any more, referring the Reader to the Discourse it self, which I wish were reprinted for the Honour of God, and the Benefit of the Church. Dr. Taylor plainly asserts this H. Sacrament to be a Sacrifice. In the x. Sect. of the iv. Ch. of his Rule of H. Living, where he saith, That the Celebration of the H. Sacrament succeeds to the most solemn Rite of natural, and Judaical Religion, the Law of Sacrificing. And that as Christ represents to his Father the great effective Sacrifice which he offered on the Cross as a means of Attonement, and Expiation for all Mankind: so he hath appointed that the same Ministry shall be done upon Earth too in our manner, and according to our Proportion; and therefore hath instituted, and separated an Order of Men; by sacramental Representation to pray unto God after the same manner, that our Lord, and H. Priest doth, that is, to offer to God, and represent in this solemn Prayer, and Sacrament Christ as already offered, whereby our Prayers may for his Sake, and in the same manner of Intercession be offer'd up to God. And so in the Office for the H. Communion in his Collection of Offices: Be thou well pleased, O Lord, with this our Service, and Duty, and grant that with a holy Fear, and pure Conscience we may finish this Service, presenting a holy Sacrifice wholly unto thee that thou mayest receive it in Heaven, and smell a sweet Odour in the Union of the eternal Sacrifice, which our blessed Lord perpetually offers, and accepts it graciously, as thou didst entertain the Gifts of Abel, the Sacrifice of Noah, the Services of Moses, and Aaron, the Peace Offering of Samuel, &c. So in the Prayer of Consecration: Have Mercy upon us, O heavenly Father, according to thy glorious Mercies, and Promises; send thy H. Ghost upon our Hearts, and let him also descend upon these Gifts, &c. and bless, and sanctify these Gifts. So in the Prayer of Oblation: We humbly present unto thee, O Lord, this present Sacrifice of remembrance,

and

*and Thanksgiving, &c. So also in the Prayer for the Catholick Church, all after the ancient Practice. Receive, O Eternal God, this Sacrifice for, and in behalf of all Christian People, &c. The Bp. of Sarum on Article XXXI. writes of the Holy Eucharist in these Words: In two other respects it may also more strictly be called a Sacrifice. One is because there is an Oblation of Bread, and Wine made in it, which being sacrificed, are consumed in an act of Religion. To this many Passages in the Writings of the Fathers relate. This was the Oblation which was made at the Altar by the People. And though at first the Christians were reproached, as having a strange sort of Religion in which they had neither Temples, Altars, nor Sacrifices, because they had not those things in so gross a manner, as the Heathens had, yet both Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and all the succeeding Writers of the Church, do frequently mention the Oblations that they made, and in the ancient Liturgies they did with particular Prayers offer the Bread, and Wine to God, as the Creator of all things. These were called the Gifts, and Offerings, which were offered to God in imitation of Abel, who offered the Fruits of the Earth in a Sacrifice to God. Both Justin Martyr, Irenæus, the Constitutions, and all the ancient Liturgies, have express words relating to this. Another respect in which the Eucharist is called a Sacrifice, is because it is a Commemoration, and Representation to God of the Sacrifice, that Christ offered for us upon the Cross. — Upon these accounts we do not deny but that the Eucharist may be well called a Sacrifice. But still it is a commemorative Sacrifice, and not <sup>m</sup> propitiatory. And afterwards: All that the first Ages may say in Homilies, or Treaties of Piety, concerning the pure Offering, that, according to Malachi, all Christians, offered to God in the Sacrament, the Sacrifice, and un-*

---

<sup>m</sup> The Bishop means not Propitiatory in it self or by its own Virtue, as the Papists assert their Sacrifice of the Mass to be.

bloody Sacrifice of Christians, must be understood to relate to the Prayers, and Thanksgivings, that accompanied it; so the Commemoration that was made in it of the Sacrifice once offered upon the Cross, and finally to the Oblation of the Bread, and Wine, which they so often compare both to Abel's Sacrifice, and to Melchisedeck's offering Bread and Wine. And I wish his Lordship had been pleased to add expressly, what is implied, that the Eucharist was also called a Sacrifice by the Ancients, because the Oblation of Bread, and Wine, which they compared to other External Sacrifices, was always brought to the Priest to be presented by him, as sacrificial Gifts to God upon the Holy Table, or Altar, and after the Prayer of Thanksgiving to be consecrated by him in a second solemn Oblation, in which he said, Not only we offer unto thee these Gifts, but these Gifts, which are set before Thee; those Gifts, of which thou hast no need, and we beseech thee to send down thy Holy Spirit upon them, to sanctify them, and make them unto us the (mystical) Body and Blood of Christ. This in Substance is the Form of Consecration in all the ancient Greek Offices, as I have shew'd in my first Letter, and was restored by the Compilers of the *Scottish Liturgy* to the Prayer of Consecration.

It is plain that Bishop *Andrews* thought the Holy Eucharist to be the Christian Sacrifice by this Prayer in his <sup>n</sup> Greek and Latin Devotions.

Ὁ ἄνω παρ' Πατρὸς ὑψιστάτην  
 Καὶ ὡς ἡμῖν ἀοράτως Συνών,  
 Ἐλθε εἰς τὸ ἀγιάσαι ὁ παρ' ἐμὲ ΔΩΡΑ  
 Καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν, καὶ δι' ὧν καὶ ἵπ' οἷς  
 Πρὸς κομιζόν.

<sup>n</sup> P. 214, 215.

• Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12. τὰ παρ' ἐμὲ δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου; cap. 13. ὑπὲρ ὧν δῶρα καὶ πρὸς κομιζόντων κλεῖψαι τὸ δεῶν. See the whole Prayer in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysost. in *Goar's Euchologium*.



Qui sursum cum Patre sedes  
Et invisibilis hic præsens nobiscum es,  
Veni, ut sanctifices dona proposita,  
Pro quibus, & à quibus, & quibus de causis  
Offeruntur.

*Thou, Lord, who with the Father sitt'st on high,  
Present to us below invisibly :  
Come, sanctifie the Gifts before thee laid,  
By, or for whomsoe'r the Offering's made ;  
Or for whatever Cause the poor acknowledgment is paid.* }

Dr. Heylin in his *Antidotum Lincolnense* (London printed 1637.) chap. 5. cites a noble Testimony out of *Eusebius, De Demonstratione Evangelica*, about the Priesthood, Altar, and Sacrifice of the Christians, with which I will here present the Reader in his own Version : *Eusebius* brings in this Prediction from the Prophet *Esay*, That “ in that day there shall be an  
“ Altar to the Lord, in the midst of the Land of E-  
“ gypt, *Isa. 19. 19.* Then adds, that if they had  
“ an Altar, and were to sacrifice <sup>p</sup> to Almighty  
“ God, πάντως πρὸς καὶ ἱεροσυνῶν ἀξιώθησιν, they  
“ must be thought worthy of a Priesthood also.  
“ But the Levitical Priesthood could not be of any  
“ use unto them, and therefore they must have an-  
“ other. Nor was this spoke, says he, of the E-  
“ gyptians only, <sup>q</sup> but of all other Nations, and ido-  
“ latrous People, who now pour forth Prayers, not  
“ unto many Gods, but to the one and only Lord :  
“ and unto him erect an Altar for reasonable and  
“ unbloody Sacrifices [καὶ τέτω θυσιάζησιν ἀναίμων  
“ καὶ λογικῶν θυσιῶν, &c. ἀνεγήτορ] in every place  
“ of the whole habitable World, according to the  
“ Mysteries of the New Testament. Now what

<sup>p</sup> Εἴτα ὃ θύοντες τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων θεῶν, &c. cap. 6.

<sup>q</sup> Πάν ἡμέτερον εἶδω λατρεῶν ἀνθρώπων.

those Mysteries were he declares more fully in the tenth Chapter of the said first Book. " Christ, " saith he, is the propitiatory Sacrifice for all our " Sins, since when even those amongst the Jews are " freed from the Curse of Moses's Law, εὐχότως ἔ " ἢ σώματα αὐτῶ καὶ ἔ αἷμα ἔ εὐμνησιν ὁσημέραι " ἐπιειδέντες, celebrating daily (as they ought) the " Commemoration of his Body and Blood, which " is a far more excellent Sacrifice and Ministry, than " any in the former times. Then adds, That " Christ our Saviour offering such a wonderful and " excellent Sacrifice to his heavenly Father for the " Salvation of usall, appointed us to offer daily un- " to God the Commemoration of the same, ἀντὶ ἑ " δυοίας, for and as a Sacrifice. And anon after, " that whensoever we do celebrate τὰς ἑ δύναντες " ἑ μνήμην, the Memory of that Sacrifice on the " Table, participating of the Elements of his Bo- " dy and Blood, we should say with David, Thou " preparest a Table for me in the presence of mine En- " mies, thou anointest my Head with Oil, my Cup run- " neth over. Wherein, saith he, he signifies most " manifestly the Mystical Unction, καὶ τὰ ἑμνὰ ἑ " Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἑ δύναντος, and the reverend Sacrifi- " ces of Christ's Table, where we are taught to offer " up unto the Lord, by his own most eminent and " glorious Priest, the unbloody, reasonable, and " most acceptable Sacrifice all our Life long. This " he intitles afterwards, the Sacrifice of Praise, the " divine, reverend, and most bely Sacrifice, the pure " Sacrifice of the New Testament. So that we see, " that in this Sacrifice prescrib'd the Christian " Church by our Lord and Saviour, there were two " proper and distinct Actions: The first to cele-

ἑ Τὰς ἀναιμὰς καὶ λῶσικας αὐτῶ τε προσπηγὺς δυοίας.

ἑ Θυσίαν μνήμης, ἑ ἑμνὰ καὶ ἑ ἑστρεπὲς δύναντος, ἑ καθαρὰν δυοίαν.

brate the Memorial of our Saviour's Sacrifice,  
 which he intitles, *ῥύματις αὐτοῦ τῆς κοινῆς ἐπιμνηστεύσεως*,  
 the Commemoration of his Body and Blood once  
 offer'd; *ῥύματις* *ἡ μνήμη*, the Memory of  
 that his Sacrifice; that is, as he doth clearly ex-  
 pound himself, that we should offer *μνήμην αὐτοῦ*  
*ῥύματις*, this our Commemoration for a Sacrifice.  
 The second, that withal we should offer to him the  
 Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, which is the  
 reasonable Sacrifice of a Christian Man, and to  
 him most acceptable. Finally, he joins both these  
 together in the conclusion of that Book, and there-  
 in does at full describe the Nature of this Sacri-  
 fice, which is thus as followeth: *Ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἡ θυσία  
 ἡ δομιώμενη τότε μὴ ἡ μνήμη καὶ μεγάλη ῥύματις*,  
 &c. therefore, saith he, we Sacrifice, and offer  
 as it were with Incense; the Memory of that great  
 Sacrifice, celebrating the same according to the  
 Mysteries by him given unto us, and giving  
 thanks to him for our Salvation; with godly  
 Hymns and Prayers to the Lord our God; as also  
 offering to him our whole selves, both Soul and  
 Body, and to his High-Priest, which is the Word.  
 See here Eusebius does not call it only the Memory  
 or Commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice; but makes  
 the very Memory or Commemoration in and of  
 its self to be a Sacrifice, which *instar omnium*, for  
 and in the place of all other Sacrifices we are to  
 offer to our God, and offer it with a *δομιώμενη*,  
 the Incense of our Prayers and Praises. To this  
 Passage let me add another for the sake of those  
 Presbyters, who doubt whether they are proper  
 Priests, out of the same Chapter.

“ And first beginning with the Priesthood, in case  
 “ you are not grown asham'd of that holy Calling,

“ καὶ ἡ κοινὴ ἑσπερία νύκτις εὐχαριστία, δι' ἐννοίας ὑμνων  
 τε καὶ ὁρχῶν τῇ θεῷ παρασκευάζοντες.

“ you

" you may remember, that you were admitted into  
 " Hqly Orders by no other Name: Being present-  
 " ed to the Bishop at your Ordination, " you did  
 " require to be admitted to the *Order of Priesthood*:  
 " and being demanded by the Bishop, if you did  
 " think in your Heart, that you were truly call'd ac-  
 " cording to the Will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the  
 " Order of this Church of England, unto the Mini-  
 " stry of the Priesthood; you answer'd positively that  
 " you did. If you thought otherwise than you said,  
 " as you do-sometimes, you " *lied not unto Men, but*  
 " *unto God*. Look in the Book of Ordination, and  
 " you shall find it oftner than once or twice, enti-  
 " tuled, *The Office of Priesthood*, and the *Holy Office of*  
 " *Priesthood*: The Parties thereunto admitted, call'd  
 " by no other Name, than that of Priests: Or if  
 " you think the *Book of Ordination* is no good Au-  
 " thority (to which you have subscrib'd however  
 " in your Subscription to the *Articles*) look then  
 " upon the *Liturgy*, and the *Rubricks* of it, by which  
 " you would persuade the World, that you are  
 " very much directed in all this business; Find you  
 " not there the name of Priest exceeding frequent,  
 " especially in that part thereof, which concerns  
 " the Sacrament? *The Priest standing at the North*  
 " *side of the Table* — *Then shall the Priest rehearse*  
 " *distinctly all the Ten Commandments* — *Then shall*  
 " *the Priest say to them that come to receive the Holy*  
 " *Communion* — *Then shall the Priest, turning him-*  
 " *self to the People, give the Absolution* — *Then shall*  
 " *the Priest, kneeling down at God's Board, &c.*

Bishop Stillingfleet saith, It is the peculiar honour of the  
 Christian Religion, to have an Order of Men set apart,  
 not merely as Priests to offer Sacrifices (for that all Re-  
 ligions have had) but as Preachers of Righteousness, to  
 set Good and Evil before the People committed to their

---

▪ Book of Ordination.

▪ Acts v. 4.



*Charge.* This is exactly agreeable to that of St. Hierom, in his Epistle to Evagrius, *De Gradibus Presbyteri & Diaconi.* Ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, quod Aaron & Filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc Episcopi, Presbyteri, & Diaconi in Ecclesia sibi vendicent. So in his Epistle *Ad Neporianum, Esto subjectus Pontifici tuo*—Quod Aaron, & Filios ejus, hoc Episcopum & Presbyteros esse noverimus. Those who desire more Authorities may consult the *Appendix*, to which I refer the Reader.

And to these Authorities of learned Men in Print, I shall add others of no less moment out of an interleaved \* *Book of Common-Prayer*, with Notes, which I happened to meet with, and value very much. In the Prayer of Consecration on these Words, *Sufficient Sacrifice*, & paulo post, *that his precious Death.* THAT. *This Word refers to the Sacrifice mentioned lin. 8: for we still continue and remember that Sacrifice, which Christ once made upon the Cross. And this Sacrifice which the Church makes (as a Sacrifice is taken pro maculatione & occisione victimæ) is only Commemorative, and Sacramental; for in that sense Christ only offered it really upon the Cross by his*

---

\* This Book was imprinted in Fol. at London by Robert Barker Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, Anno Dom. 1617. I cannot tell who was the Author, or Collector of the Notes, but perhaps some other Person may by these following Observations: At the third Exhortation to the Communion, he refers to his Sermon on the Pharisee, and Publican. *Luke xviii. 13. part 2.* At the Prayer before Consecration, *vid. Conc. nostram, in 1 Cor. ii. Whosoever shall eat, &c.* He speaks of Bishop Overall, as then Bishop of Norwich. At Baptism. *Vide Concionem meam ad Joh. iii. Except ye be born of Water, &c. Liber Constit. Ecclesia Anglicana, qui compositus est ab illo qui πολλῶν ἀντάξι' ἁλλων, f. O.* He often calls him my Lord Overall in his Notes. In the Catechism at these words, *Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, &c. Vide Concionem meam in hunc locum tempore pomeridiano.* At the Office of Burial, *Vide Concionem nostram ad Pl. 96. O worship the Lord in the Beauty of Holiness.*

own Death. And so likewise as it is taken for a visible Sacrifice, Christ only offered it; for here it is invisible. But as it is taken for a sufficient Sacrifice to take away the Sins of the World: So indeed it was offered upon the Cross, as having Power in it self to abolish all Sin whatsoever. But it doth not abolish any Man's Sin for all that, unless it be applied, and the ways to apply it to Man are divers; by Faith; by good Works; by the unbloody offering up of the same Sacrifice; by the receiving his most precious Body, and Blood. And if we compare the Eucharist with the Sacrifice once made upon the Cross with reference to the killing, and destroying of the Sacrifice, or with reference to the visibility of it, in that sense we call it only a Commemorative Sacrifice, as the Fathers do. Chrysost. Hom. contra Judæos part 2. Lombard Sent. lib. 4. dist. 12. But if we compare the Eucharist with Christ's Sacrifice made once upon the Cross, as concerning the effect of it, we say, that That was a sufficient Sacrifice; but without, that this is a true, real, and efficient Sacrifice, and both of them propitiatory for the Sins of the whole World. And therefore in the Oblation following, we pray, that it may prevail so with God, that we, and all the whole Church of Christ (which consists of more than those who are upon the Earth) may receive the benefit of it.

Neither

---

<sup>1</sup> That is, in different senses: The one propitiates as having Power, Force, and Virtue in it self to make Propitiation, and the other propitiates, not by any Virtue it hath in it self to make Propitiation, but in virtue of the Sacrifice of Christ: And to this purpose he speaks in his Notes on the Prayer, after the Communion, O Lord, and heavenly Father. It may be called a Propitiatory Sacrifice, not that it makes any Propitiation, as that of the Cross did, but because it obtaineth, and bringeth into all that Propitiation, which was once made by Christ; and so we may speak of Prayer, that it is Propitiatory too.

<sup>2</sup> This Author, as also appears from the Notes upon the Prayer after the Communion, did believe the Eucharist to be a representative Sacrifice of Christ's Death upon the Cross for the Sins, and for the Benefits of the whole World; the whole Church, that both those,

Neither do we call this Sacrifice of the Eucharist an efficient Sacrifice, as if that upon the Cross wanted efficacy; but because the Force, and Virtue of that Sacrifice could not be profitable unto us, unless it were applied, and brought into effect by this Eucharistical Sacrifice, and other the Holy Sacraments, and means appointed by God for that end. But we call it Propitiatory both this, and that, because both of them have Force, and Virtue in them to appease God's Wrath. See Maldonat. de Sacrament, p. 323. Therefore this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every Day offered to God by Christ in Heaven, and continued here still on Earth by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new Propitiation, or new Remission of Sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in all applied to us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross.

Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there *Modo Cruento*, so much remembred in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual, and daily offering it by Christ now

---

those, who are here on Earth, and those that rest in the Sleep of Peace, being departed in the Faith of Christ may find the effect, and virtue of it, for this he appeals to the Authority of the ancient Church, and in particular cites the Words of St. Chrysost. in Matth. 8. *Idcirco altari assistens Sacerdos, pro universo orbe terrarum, pro absentibus, atque presentibus, pro his, qui postea futuri sunt, Sacrificio illo proposito Deo, nos gratias habet offerre. Hom. 72. in Jo-han. Ideo in mysteriis invicem salutamus, ut multi unum efficiamur & Communes pro ceteris preces effundimus, pro infirmis, & terra, maris, & universi orbis finibus sacrificamus.*

\* Here he takes Sacraments in the general improper sense of the word, as Calvin. hist. lib. 4. cap. 14. *Impositionem manuum, qua Ecclesie ministri in suum munus iniciantur, ut non inuitus patior vocari Sacramentum: ita inter ordinaria Sacramenta non numera. And in the Notes on the Answer to the Question in the Church-Catechism, How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church? He asserts there are but two Sacraments in the strict, and proper acceptation of the word, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*

in Heaven, in his everlasting Priesthood; and thereupon was, and should be still the jure Sacrificium observ'd here on Earth, as it is in Heaven. The reason which the ancient Fathers had for their daily Sacrifice. St. Chrysost. in 10 ad Hebr. In Christo semel oblata est hostia ad salutem potens. Quid ergo nos? Per singulos dies offerimus? & si quotidie offerimus ad recordationem ejus oblationis fit. St. August. de Civ. D. l. 10. c. 29. Ipse sacerdos, & ipsa oblatio, Cujus rei Sacramentum quotidianum esse voluit Ecclesia Sacrificium. So in the Thanksgiving after the Lord's Prayer upon these words, To accept this our Sacrifice of Praise, and Thanksgiving.

So the ancient Fathers were wont to call this Sacrifice, Sacrificium Laudis & Gratiarum actionis; not exclusively, as if it were no other Sacrifice but that; for they called it also Sacrificium Commemorationis, & Sacrificium Spiritus, & Sacrificium Obsequii, &c. and which is more, Sacrificium Verum & Propitiatorium. All other ways but this, the Eucharist, or any other Sacrifice we make are improperly, & secundum quamdam similitudinem, called Sacrifices: The true and proper nature of a Sacrifice is, To be an<sup>a</sup> Oblation of some real and<sup>b</sup> sensible Thing, made only to<sup>c</sup> God, for the acknowledging of Man's<sup>d</sup> subjection to God, and of God's supreme Dominion over Man, made by a<sup>e</sup> lawful Ministry, and performed by certain Mysteries, Rites, and Ceremonies, which Christ and his Church have ordained.

<sup>a</sup> When we say 'tis an Oblation, we say two things, 1st, That the true Nature and Essence of a Sacrifice consists only, tanquam in Genere, in the offering of it; and though we do not say, that the killing of the thing to be sacrificed, or any other Ceremony to be used about it is a Sacrifice; for that is, and ever was called the Sacrifice which belonged to the Priest's Office alone; now the Levites might kill the Sacrifice, but none could offer it except the Priest: Oblatio ergo est genus Sacrificii.

2dly,



2dly, That every Offering is not called a Sacrifice, but every Sacrifice is an Offering; for there were many things that private Men came to offer, as first Fruits, &c. which were not called Sacrifices.

<sup>b</sup> When we say it is an Oblation of some sensible thing, it is to shew, that every act of our Religion, whereby we profess our subjection unto God, is not properly called a Sacrifice in Scripture; for we profess that, by confessing of our Sins, by Prayer, by Praise, &c. which are no proper Sacrifices.

<sup>c</sup> As a part of that Worship which is only due to God; &c. Exod. xxii. there is a Command, that no Sacrifice be made but only to God alone. And it is so his due, that without it we hardly acknowledge him to be our God, and for that reason we profess it here in this Offer-tory, or Eucharistical Passage. That it is our bounden Duty and Service so to do; therefore as there never was, nor could be any Religion without a God, so there never was, nor can be any without Sacrifice, being one of the chiefest Acts, whereby we profess our Religion to him, whom we serve.

<sup>d</sup> The end of all Sacrifices; for though every Sacrifice had some special End whereunto it was made, yet there was none of them all which had not this for their general Aim and Scope.

<sup>e</sup> To exclude many private Offerings, which in Scripture are called Sacrifices, but not properly.

<sup>f</sup> The general form of a Sacrifice, which consisted always in some ceremonious Offering of it, the better to express the Mystery contained in it, &c. ergo Tents and first Fruits, though they were offered unto God, yet because they were not offered up ritu Mystico, they were no proper Sacrifices.

But those which were properly called Sacrifices, were three ways distinguished: 1. In Matter. 2. In Form. 3. In the End.

In Matter, either when the thing to be offered was alive, and then it was called *Victima*, or *Res solida*,

but not Viva; and it was called *Immolatio* (as the Fathers were wont to call their Sacrifices *Immolationes*, a *Mola*, or a *Molendo*) or *res Liquida*, and it was called *Libamentum*.

And besides these, we find in Scripture seven Appellations of a Sacrifice by way of Analogy only, but not truly and properly.

In Form, either when all the Sacrifice was consumed by Fire, and it was call'd *Holocaustum*; or part of it by Fire, and part by the Priest, and it was call'd *Hostia Pacifica*.

In the End, either when it was offered in Recognition of God's supreme Dominion; and then it was call'd *Holocaustum*, which was all burned, to signify, that it was all and wholly from God, whatsoever Man enjoyed; or for the obtaining of the Remission of Sins, and it was called the *Sin-Offering*; or for Thanksgiving after Victories, &c. and it was called *Hostia Pacifica*. Therefore because the chief and general end of every Sacrifice was to acknowledge God's Majesty and Dominion over the World; Hence it is that every act almost which did but shew so much as that, was called in Scripture a Sacrifice, in Analogy to the other. As first, When Men submit themselves to God in their Souls. So Ps. 15. *A broken Spirit is a Sacrifice to God.* 2. When Men offered up their Bodies as lively Sacrifices, Rom. 12. 1. *by keeping them pure, and clean from Sin.* 3. By taming, and afflicting the Body, Heb. 11. *tanquam Holocausti hostiam accipit eos.* 4. By Words, *Immola Deo Sacrificium Laudis, Vitulos Labiorum.* 5. By Works of Mercy, Heb. 13. *for with these Sacrifices God is well pleased.* 6. The whole giving of a Man's self up to God, Rom. 15. Phil. 2. 7. The profession of all Ministerial Functions in Divine Things, because, by that Service, Men profess themselves to be Subject and Servants unto God, Rom. 15. *Obsequii mei oblationem.*

Now

Now the Eucharist, though by way of Analogy it be called a Sacrifice, many of these ways, yet the true and real Nature of it in the Offertory, is to acknowledge God's Majesty and one Mystery, and to appease his Wrath towards us, to get Blessings from him, to make Christ's bloody Sacrifice effectual unto us. See the Notes upon this Word in the Form of Consecration before.

<sup>b</sup> And so tho' it may be called a Sacrifice most of the seven ways, yet not in the strictness and rigor of Speech: For so was there never any Sacrifice, nor ever shall be any but Christ's alone; and yet formally and truly it may be called a Sacrifice also, in the very natural signification of a Sacrifice, for ought I know of any harm may come thereby. See the Exposition of the place in Malachi, apud Maldon. de Sacram. p. 326. and of Ps. 100. Tu es Sacerdos, &c. both which the ancient Fathers, with one consent, understood of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, and the Priests of the Gospel.

The definition of a Sacrifice, which is here given, is not, as <sup>c</sup> mine is, a definition of Sacrifice in the most general sense, as it is common to all sorts of Sacrifices of any Religion true, or false, by what Rites, in what manner soever offered, but a particular definition of an Oblation, made only to the true God by the hands of a lawful Minister, whether it were, or were not, <sup>d</sup> consumed in whole, or in part, upon the Altar by Fire, Effusion, or Sprinkling, which were but the Rites attending some sort of Sacrifices among the Jews, but not all. And as according to this definition, the Author of it hath proved the Eucharist to be a real Sacrifice: So the Ministers of it must be real Priests. It is also to be observed, that his distinction between an Oblation, and a Sacrifice is

---

<sup>b</sup> These words are in the Margin of the Original, *The People may offer it up all the improper ways; none but the Priest can offer it, as it is a proper Sacrifice.*

<sup>c</sup> P. 74.

<sup>d</sup> See p. 65, 66, &c.

in effect the same with theirs, who, according to the Hebrew word *Corban*, making Sacrifice, and Oblation equivalent Terms, then divide Sacrifice, as a *Genus*, into its Species, of which a Sacrifice offered by a Priest to God upon a Table or Altar, with certain Rites, and Ceremonies is one, and one of the most solemn sort.

And now, I hope, by these Additional Authorities, and those cited in my Book, and in the *Appendix* to it, I shall convince the *late Writer*, I have spoken of in the beginning of my *first* Letter, that the *Eucharist* is a proper Sacrifice, and that we, who offer it, are *proper Priests*, and that there can be no danger in this Doctrine, which was taught, and practised by all the ancient Catholick Church. I hope also what I have said here, and in that Letter, will sufficiently refute, and expose the incomparable presumption of the Author of the *Rights*, who represents the whole Notion of the Lord's Supper, as I have shew'd it was taught in the primitive Times, for *Priestcraft*, saying, *That they made it a Mystery in the heathenish sense of the Word, and for heathenish reasons, that they might have the same Power, as the Priests of Idols had, to exclude whom they pleased to term unworthy.* <sup>e</sup> He ridicules the Notion of Consecration, as invented by the Fathers to produce the real Presence, and make the *Eucharist* a real Sacrifice, and the Ministry real Priests, and the Communion-Table an Altar, and saith, that among Christians, one no more than another, can be reckoned a Priest from Scripture, — and that there is no more reason to affirm, that the Minister offers up the Peoples Prayers, than they his, except it can be supposed that God hears him only, who talks the loudest, in that he is the Servant of the Congregation — and the Clerk hath as good a Title to the Priesthood as the Parson, since the People join with him

---

\* P. 101, 102, &c.

<sup>e</sup> P. 102, 104.



in offering up their Sacrifices of Spiritual Songs, Hymns, and Thanksgivings.

This is a heavy charge of heathenish Knavery, and Priestcraft upon all the ancient Fathers, as well those who lived with the Apostles, as those who lived not long after them, who, as it were, with one Voice taught the *Holy Eucharist* to be a Sacrifice, as I have shewed in the first Letter. They are all included in this impudent Charge of *heathenish Priestcraft*, and perhaps if he durst, he would have laid it upon the Apostle, as well as by consequence upon his Fellow Labourer, St. *Clement*; for he spoke of the Holy Eucharist after the same heathenish manner, as he will have it, in *Sacrificial Terms*; for such are not only <sup>a</sup> *Altar*, both in the literal, and figurative sense for an *Altar-offering*, but the *Lord's Table*, and the *Lord's Supper*; for Antiquaries know, that it was the Custom among the Greeks after Sacrifice was ended, to make a Feast, and that for that purpose there were Tables set up in the Temples. <sup>b</sup> Hence the words, which express *Eating*, and *Drinking*, and *Feasting*, are often used for Sacrificing, as in *Virgil's Æneid*. Lib. IV.

<sup>i</sup> *Jupiter omnipotens, cui nunc Maurusia piætis  
Gens Epulata toris, Lenaum libat Honorem.*

Hence the Gods are said to feast with Men, *Odyss. v.* and *Jupiter*, and the rest of the Gods are said to go to feast in *Æthiopia*. And in the Old Testament, these heathenish Sacrificial Words, and Phrases are often used by the Holy Pen-men, as in the Prophet <sup>k</sup> *Ezech.* where the just Man is said to be one, *who*

---

<sup>a</sup> See §. VI, VII. of the first Letter.

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Potter's *Archæologia Græca*, Vol. I. p. 232, 233.

<sup>i</sup> §. ix. Of the *Christian Priesthood* asserted.

<sup>k</sup> Ch. xviii. 26.

had not eaten upon the Mountains, nor lift up his Eyes to the Idols. And in <sup>1</sup> Exodus, To go into the Wilderness to sacrifice to the Lord, and to hold a Feast to him there, signify the same thing. And the Sacrifice to the Golden Calf is described after this manner: When Aaron saw it, he built an Altar before it, and made proclamation, saying, to morrow is a Feast to the Lord. And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered Burnt-Offerings, and brought Peace-Offerings, and the People sat down to eat, and to drink (upon the Peace-Offerings) and rose up to play. Eating of the Sacrifices, or Sacrificial Entertainments were common to all Religions, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Gentile; and therefore, when God commanded the Israelites to destroy the Altars of the Inhabitants of the Land, he said, Thou shalt worship no other God, for the Lord, whose Name is jealous, is a Jealous God, lest thou make a Covenant with the Inhabitants of the Land, and go a whoring after their Gods, and do Sacrifice to them, and one call thee, and thou eat of their Sacrifice. I have shew'd, that it was in a parallel between the Sacrificial Eating of Pagans in the Temples of their Gods, and that of the Christians in their Churches, that the Apostle <sup>m</sup> said, Ye cannot drink of the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils. Here the Holy Apostle is involved in his Indictment of Priestcraft, and making the Eucharist a Mystery in the heathenish sense of the word, as well as in calling it the Lord's Supper; for the word Supper, or Feast, or any other word for Eating, and Drinking that relates to any God, or Temple, is a Sacrificial Term. So in <sup>n</sup> Julius Pollux, the hea-

<sup>1</sup> Ch. iii. 18. v. 1.

<sup>m</sup> See Sect. viii. of the first Letter.

<sup>n</sup> Onomast. Lib. x. Segm. 82. ὅς τις χρεῖται βέλοισι τῷ ὀνόματι κτεινῶν ἐνθάδε ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ μάλιστα. ἢ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ δῶπαν, ἢ τὰ πρὸς θυσίαν φερόμενα, ὡς παρὰ Σοφοκλέει εἶρη) Ἐκκλησίας μαγίδας δέσπον.

thenish Banquets, in honour of their Gods, are called *ἱερὰ δεῖπνα*, *Holy Suppers*, and the Sacrificial Feasts, in honour of *Hecate*, are called her *δὶςπτοι*, or *Suppers*. And in sober truth, were every thing to be branded for heathenish, that was common to the Religions of the Heathens, Jews, and Christians; not only the names of *Mystery*, *Sacrifice*, *Priest*, and *Altar*, which these Monsters of Christians represent to the World, as all borrowed from Heathenism by crafty Christian Priests; but the Names of *God*, and *Heaven*, and *Religion*, and *Worship*, and *Temple*, must be reproached for Heathenish too. Nay, the Notion of future Rewards, and Punishments, and of the Immortality of the Soul, and whatsoever else the Christian Apologists observe to have been in any kind, or degree common to the Greeks, and Christians, must be blemished, as heathenish Inventions of Christian Priests; as *Baptism* for the mystical washing away of Sin, the *Mediatory Office* of our blessed Lord, and the eternal Generation of the *λὸς*, must also be branded for a *Christian travesty* of the Fable of *Pallas*, the Heathen Goddess of *Wisdom*, who was said to be begotten, and conceived in, and born of *Jupiter's* Brain. The Lord's Supper of the *Bread*, and the *Cup*, may at this impudent, and blaspheming way of reasoning, be ridicul'd as an heathenish Invention, borrow'd from the *°* Priests of *Mithra*, and so, according to these Blasphemers, our blessed Lord, and Redeemer, *°* The Catholick Priest of the Father, through whom we offer up our Eucharistical Sacrifice of Praise, and Thanks-

---

*°* See *Justin Martyr's* 1 *Apol.* publish'd by Dr. *Grabe* at *Oxford* in 8°. §. LXXXVI. p. 130. with his Notes on *Ἐν τοῖς ᾧ Μυθεοῖς*.

*°* *Tertul. libr. 4. contra Marcionem cap. 9. Offerre debere Orationem & actionem gratiarum apud Ecclesiam per Christum Jesum Catholicum patris Sacerdotem. Origen in Roman. 1. Debemus Sacrificium Laudis offerre per JESUM CHRISTUM. velut per Pontificem magnum.*

giving, must also come in with all his *ministerial Priests* from the Apostles to our times, for his share of *Priestcraft*.

I cannot but observe how the *Rights*, in the place before cited, calls the Eucharist the *Lord's Supper*, and not the *Sacrament*, or *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*; because, as I suppose, he knew that *Sacrament*, which was the Term of the Latin Church for it, signifies *Mystery*, and answers to the Greek word *Μυστήριον*, and that as the Greek Church always called it the *Holy Mystery*; so the Latins called it the *Holy Sacrament* of the Body, and Blood of Christ. And as a religious *Mystery*, is so called, in a sense common to Heathens, and Christians, because it exhibits one thing to the outward Senses, and another to the Understanding: So, in most eminent manner, the Church always called *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper* *Mysteries*, because they were outward, visible, holy Signs of a secret religious Signification, which none but Christians, or Christian *Catechumens* understood, and therefore if one of these *Mysteries* is a Creature of *Priestcraft* in a *heathenish sense*, and for *heathenish reasons*, the other is so too.

I cannot but observe how craftily this Accuser of the Clergy, without any distinction of Times, or Persons, lays the charge of *Priestcraft* equally on all Christian Priests of all Ages, as if there were no difference between the more Primitive, and Pure, and the latter, and corrupt Ages of the Church, or between reformed Churches, and those which remain unreformed. *Nothing*, saith he, *would expose Priestcraft more, than an Historical Account how, and upon what Motives the Clergy varied in their Notions and Practices concerning the Lord's Supper. As first, how they made it a Mystery in the heathenish sense of the Word, and for heathenish reasons.* Here is no difference made between the Apostles, and the Apostolical Churches and Clergy, and those which varied from



from the Apostolical Doctrines, and Practice; no distinction of Heretical, or Schismatical Churches and Clergy from the truly Catholick, or of the Ages of pure Light, and Truth, from those of Darkeness, Error, and Ignorance; but for once to use a vulgar Proverb, he shakes the Clergy of all Centuries in a Bag together, and that Priest which is first taken out, tho' he were an Apostle, or Apostolick Priest, tho' he were never so holy a Martyr, or Confessor, be he who he will, or of what Church, or Age soever, he must be no better than an Idol-Priest, a mere Priestcraft Villain, and Knave, who of making the Eucharist a Mytery, and Sacrifice, and himself a Sacrificer, afterwards presumed to make it a God. This is a Fallacy runs almost through the whole Book of the *Rights*, and at this impudent way of arguing, he may turn all the Doctrines of Christianity into Priestcraft. *Nothing*, may a Man say, *would expose Priestcraft more than an Historical Account, how, and for what Motives, the Clergy varied in their Notions, and Practices concerning Church-Government. As first, how they set up Men call'd Apostles, and then Bishops, and Priests, and Deacons in the heathenish sense of the words, and for heathenish reasons, who had Arch-priests, Priests, and inferior Ministers, who usurped Power over the People, and excluded whom they would, as unworthy, and as the Heathens had one Sovereign Pontiff over all their Arch-priests, and Priests, so the Clergy, to magnifie their Power, were never quiet, till the more effectually to enslave the People in a most heathenish manner, and for heathenish reasons, they set up another PONTIFEX MAXIMUS at Rome. So it may be said in this blasphemous way, Nothing would expose Priestcraft more, than an Historical Account, how, and for what Motives the Clergy varied in their Notions concerning Jesus of Nazareth, as first, how they made him a Prophet, then a King, and at last, in a heathenish manner, and for heathenish reasons, a So-*  
vereign

vereign Pontiff, and <sup>a</sup> Dæmon-like Mediator betwixt God and Man, that in his Name they may get the same Power over the People, as the Idol Priests had, and exclude whom they would, as unworthy. Nay, might he not falsely say, they were never quiet till of an inferior Ministerial sort of God, under the one supreme God as they first taught him to be, they met together, and made and determined him to be an Essential God, very God of very God, of one Substance with the Almighty Father, equal to the supreme God, to exalt their Power by a pretended spiritual Authority under him in a *heathenish* manner, not only over the People, but over Senates, and Kings.

I must also observe, with what assurance this doubty Champion, and Pen-man of the *Club* derives the Christian Notion of Sacrifice, Priest, and Altar by *Priestcraft* from the Heathens, contrary to the known Original, and first Propagation of the Christian Religion from the Jewish Church, and among the Jews. Did he not know that the blessed Founder of it was a *Jew*, and all his Apostles *Jews*, who were versed in the Scriptures, and Religious Rites, and Customs of the *Jews*? Did he not know that Christianity is nothing but mystical, or reformed Judaism, and that our Lord himself us'd the words *Altar*, *Gift*, or Sacrifice, and *Offering* in a Precept to his Disciples? and did he borrow them from the Heathens, or from the *Jewish* Church? Did St. Paul, who was an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the Law a Pharisee, and conversant in *Moses*, and the Prophets, and in their Temple Worship: did he, I say, who was vers'd in the Greek, as well as the Hebrew Testament borrow the word *Θυσιαστήριον* *Altar*, from the Heathen, or from the *Hellenistical* Writers,

---

<sup>a</sup> See the History of Religion.

<sup>f</sup> who

who so carefully used this word both in their Versions of the Old Testament, and their other Writings in distinction from *Βωμ*, which the Heathens used for the Altars of their Gods. But because *Heathen*, and *Heathenish* will make a terrible sound in the Ears of some Readers, and raise odious Ideas with Fears and Jealousies in their minds, therefore whatever Christianity hath in common with the Religions of the Jews, and Heathens, it must be all *heathenish*, and for *heathenish reasons*; its *Priests*, and *Sacrifice*, and *Altars*, its *Excommunications*, the *Mediation*, and *High-priesthood* of its Redeemer, must be represented as heathenish, and, if he durst, he might have represented every thing in the Jewish Religion, as heathenish too. But that was too bold a Stroke at first, but hereafter perhaps they may arrive at that Confidence, unless *Josephus* against *Appion*, and the Christian Apologists, and *Cyril of Alexandria's* Answer to *Julian* the Apostate, should stand in their way, who have shew'd that the *Greeks* were but Boys and Children to the Hebrews, and that like Plagiarists, they borrowed all their Learning sacred and prophane, relating to Law, or Religion from them. Indeed *Paganism*, as Learned Men have often shew'd, is but *Judaism* corrupted from the Service of one true God to the worship of Devils; and as I must observe again, if every thing in the Christian Religion, whereof there is the like among Pagans, must pass for Heathenish Priestcraft, there will be but very little left,

---

<sup>r</sup> As in Numb. xxiii. 1, 14, 29, 30. Amos vii. 9. 1 Maccab. i. 47, 54, 59. ii. 23, 25, 45. v. 68. 2 Maccab. x. 2, 3. And this distinction was so generally observed betwixt *Θυσιαστήριον*, and *Βωμ*, that the former is but once used for the Altar of an Idol in the Version of the LXXII. 1 Kings (*Βασιλ Γ*) xviii. 26. and the latter by no Hellenistical Writer for the Altar of God, but the Author of the II. Book of *Maccabees*, who gentilizizes in his Style, ch. i. 19. xiii. 8. The same distinction is observed between *Altare* and *Ara* throughout the Latin Vulgar Bible, and all the the Latin Fathers, except *Tertullian*.

which

which must not pass for such too. Wherefore when these Blasphemers say, that such, or such a Notion or Practice in the Christian Religion was introduced by *Priestcraft* from the Heathens, it should be considered, whether the Heathens did not derive it from the Jews, or whether it is not a thing common to all Religions, and good in it self, though more or less perverted, and abused by the Heathens; nay, I will add one thing more, it ought to be considered, whether it is unlawful for Christians, or Christian Priests to borrow a proper Term, or good Custom from Paganism, or to reform and turn that to the Honour and Service of the true God, which *they* abused in the Worship of the false Gods. *Brissonius* in his *Formula* hath shew'd, that the ancient, and common Phrase in the Christian Worship *Κύριε ἰησοῦν, Lord have mercy upon us*, was one of the *Formula* of Invocation in the solemn Worship at Heathen Sacrifices; and I would ask this Man, supposing that Christian Priests anciently borrowed it from the Heathens, whether it was a Sin or Shame in them, or a Disgrace to Christianity, to transfer it from the Idol-worship of Pagans, and consecrate it, as they did their Idol-Temples, to the Service of the true God. I say, supposing, but not granting, because the Phrase is in several places of the ' Gospel, and was, without doubt, taken by the Church from thence. I also beg leave to tell him of a laudable, Religious Rite among the Heathens, who accounted the Table, at which they entertained their Friends *ἱερόν χεῖμα*, a ' *very sacred thing*, and *as a sort of Altar* for the Gods of Friendship, and Hospitality; and for this Reason it was counted a great Crime among them to dishonour them, and the " Entertainments at

---

' Matth. xv. 22. xviii. 15. xx. 30, 31.

' Dr. Potter's *Archæol. Græc.* Vol. II. ch. 20. p. 379.

" Dr. Potter's *Archæol. Græc.* Vol. II. ch. xx. p. 379.



them by any dishonest, or indecent Behaviour, according to that of *Juvenal*;

*Hic verbis nullus pudor, aut Reverentia mensa.*

They were also wont to offer *Libations* upon them in gratitude to their Gods, and, as we may be sure, never blasphemed them, or ridiculed their Oracles, or their lying Signs, and Wonders, or spoke against their Priests, as Knaves, and Priesthood, as Priestcraft, while they feasted at them; or entertained one another, and the whole Company, with such profane Discourse, as the Author of the *Rights*, and his Companions did at the Entertainment, of which I have given some account above, and as one of that sort of Men more lately did at another Table, where though no *Priest*, he presumed to say, that Preaching, Praying, and Sacraments were all *stuff*. I wish all the *Priestcraft* I am Master of were sufficient to persuade the *Archeists* and *Deists* among us, so far to return to Christianity, as to imitate the Heathens in this Religious Custom, when they sit down to Table at their Entertainments, in paying as much Honour to the true God, as they did to the false; and to be afraid, as they were, to profane their Tables with Irreligious Communication, especially with Discourses of such a direful, and piacular Nature, as if the *Gallionism* of these times suffers them to speak, and write on with impunity, will be avenged by God on the Community in heavy Judgments, which any serious Person may better imagine, than I can describe. At least, let the Ecclesiastical Authority make Enquiry after them, and when they have found them, censure them, and burn their Books; for they are *βέβηλοι, ἀνίεγοι, ἀνόμιοι, ἀνόμοιοι, ἐναγέιοι, ἑτάλαιοι*, profane, unholy, impious, ungodly, polluted, execrable Men in the *heathenish* sense of the words, and therefore for *heathenish* reasons, common with Heathens

Heathens to Jews, and Christians, let them be excluded from Christian Communion, and not suffer'd to come into our Churches, and to our Altars, or into our Pulpits to profane them. Let them be corrected at least with the *Apostolick Rod*, lest those in whose Hands it is put, by longer forbearance, provoke our Lord, whose Vicegerents they are in his Kingdom, to require the neglect of their Duty at their Hands, and tempt the People in good earnest to think, as these his Enemies would have all the World believe, that their pretended Priestly Power is indeed nothing but real *Priestcraft*.

Let them consider that all the Satanical Insults, of these Blasphemers, and all the Affronts and Reproaches they throw upon their Order, terminate in him who is the High Priest of their Profession; but he is also the *Lion* of the Tribe of *Judah*, and if he is once roused, if once he is angry at them for their too long Forbearance, then blessed are all they who do their Duty, and put their Trust in him. If once his Patience is provoked by them, he will cast the Seven Stars out of his Right Hand, and remove the Candlesticks out of their places; for the *Nonuser* of their Power, and still suffering these Men to seduce his Servants, and instruct them in the depths of Satan; And as he can come as a Thief, so none knows how quickly he may come to visit them for this great Sin of *Laziness*, and letting his Sceptre of Authority, and the Sword, and Axe of Spiritual Punishment, rust in their hands. Nay let me say, that if such Men should finally escape their Animadversion, it will be more tolerable for the Heathen Priests, even for the *Druids* themselves in the Day of Judgment (to whom the *Rights* doth liken them for *Priestcraft*) than for them; and condemn them for having less Courage, and Zeal for the Honour of the true God, and his Religion, than they had for their *Idol Gods*.

I have said all this in answer to the foul Imputation of Priestcraft, which our Author hath laid upon the Clergy of all Ages, for *making*, as he terms it, the Lord's Supper a *Mystery*, and a *Sacrifice in the heathenish sense of the Words*; and if this be heathenish Priestcraft, I confess I am most guilty of it in the following Letters, and deserve severe Punishment both from God, and Men. All serious Christians among us believe it to be a Mystery, though not to be a *Sacrifice*, a Sacrificial Mystery, as the "Passover, to which it answers, and in whose place it did succeed, by our Saviour's Institution, was.

It hath been my endeavour, especially in the first of the following Letters, to revive this ancient, true Catholick Doctrine, which hath accidentally grown into diffuse, and almost utter Oblivion in this Church, by the alterations that were made in the Office, or Order of administering the Lord's Supper in the first Liturgy of the Church of *England*, which in the \* *Appendix* I have presented to the View of the World.

In the Changes made in that Office the word *Altar*, which had been used in all Ages of the Church before, even in the purest, as well as the most corrupt, was left out of the *Rubrics*. And the Prayer of *Oblation*, which had been ever used before the delivering of the Sacrament, in which we pray God mercifully to *accept this our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, was put in the Post-Communion after the Lord's Prayer, of which I read thus in my interleaved Common-Prayer Book: *This Prayer in King Edward's VI's Service-Book was set before the delivery of the Sacrament to the People, and followed immediately after the Consecration, as certainly it was the better, and more natural Order of the two. Neither do I know whether it were the Printer's Negli-*

---

\* Exod. xv. 27. 1 Cor. v. 7.

\* No. 1.

gence, or no, thus to displace it. For the Consecration of the Sacrament being ever the first, it was always used in all Liturgies to have the Oblation follow (which is this) and then the participation, which was before, and after all the Thanksgivings, which is here set next before GLORIA IN EXCELSIS. In regard whereof I have always observed my Lord OVERALL, the Reverend Bishop of Norwich, to use this Oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament, to make an Oblation of it (as being the true publick Sacrifice of the Church) unto God; that by the Merits of Christ's Death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive Mercy, &c. as in this Prayer, and when that was done, he did Communicate the People, and so end with the Thanksgiving following hereafter. If Men would consider the Nature of this Sacrament, how it is the Christian Sacrifice also, they could not choose but use it so, too. For as it stands here it is out of its place.

In the Alterations made in the Office for Administring the Lord's Supper, in King Edward VI's Service-Book, that Rubrick was also left out, which commanded the Minister to set the Bread, and Wine upon the Altar, as an Offering. But this Rubrick was restored, in the Office for the Church of Scotland, and likewise in the Office of the Holy Communion of our present Liturgy, establish'd by the Act of Uniformity after the Restauration, with an Intention undoubtedly to oblige the Priest to place the Elements, as an Offering with Reverence upon the Lord's Table. But as the disuse of this Practice had taken deep root from the Fifth Year of King Edward VI.<sup>th</sup> when the first Service Book was altered to that time, and helpt to obliterate the Notion of the Christian Sacrifice in the Minds both of Priests, and People: So this restored Rubrick, to the great Reproach of the Clergy, was almost never since observed in Cathedral, or Parochial

Churches,



Churches. I say almost never, because I never knew, or heard but of two or three Persons, which is a very small number, who observed it; But the Bread, and Wine was still placed upon the Table before the Office of the Communion began, without any Solemnity, it may be by the Clerk, or Sexton, or any other, perhaps, *unsfitter* Person, to the great Derogation of the Reverence due to the Holy Mystery, and I hope, for the sake of my good Intentions, no worthy Clergy-man will be displeased at me for taking notice thereof.

This Practice of the *Officiating* Priests setting the Bread, and Wine in the sight of the People with Reverence upon the Holy Table, was so inviolably observed in ancient Times, that they had in their Churches a \* *Buffet*, or Side-Table on the right or left Hand of the Altar, upon which a Priest, or Deacon set the Bread, and Wine, from whence they were carried by the Deacon, or other Priest, when there were two, to the *Officiating* Priest, who reverently placed them as an Offering on the Lord's Table. This *Side-Table* for the Elements, and holy Vessels, was called in the *Greek Church* \* Πεγθεσις<sup>2</sup>, because they were first set in publick View upon it, and in the *Latin Church* *Paratorium*, because they were prepared, and made ready upon it,

\* *Ducange's Constantinopolis Christiana* Lib. iii. p. 59. See *Euseb.* in *my Gram. Franc.* p. 93.

\* *Chrylost. Opera* Tom. 4. p. 524, 535.

\* Πεγθεσις, saith *Hervetus*, propositio, ideo fortasse, quod panis, qui est a Sacerdote Consecrandus, in eo primo ponitur. In eo autem Sacerdos, quæ sunt ad Sacrificandum necessaria præparat. *Liturg. S. Chrylost. Oper. Tom. iv. p. 524.* Εὐχὴ εἰς τὴν πεγθεσιν, ὅταν τίθῃ τὰ ἱερὰ πρὸ τοῦ κομιδῆναι εἰς τὸ βῆμα, ὅς τις τὸ πρὸ εὖν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ βήματος. See also the Reverend *Sir George Wheeler's* ingenious, and accurate Description of the Churches of the Primitive Christians described by *Eusebius*, &c. p. 99. See the word in *Suicer's Thesaurus*, and *Habertus's Pontificale*, p. 2.

for the the Holy Communion; and in *Italy* it is called *CREDENZA*, in *France* *CREDENCE*, for the same Reason from the ancient *Gothick*, or *Teutonick* Verb *Garedan*, or *Geredan*; in *Saxon* *gepedan*, in *Kilian*, *Ghe-needen*, *parare*, *apparare*, *ordinare*, to make ready, to prepare. Hence the Noun *Garedeins*, or <sup>a</sup> *Geredeins*, *Garedens*, or *Geredens*, by <sup>b</sup> contraction *Gredence*, *Paratorium*, from whence *Credenza*, and <sup>c</sup> *Credence*, in barbarous Latin *Credentia*, by changing *G* into *C*, which is usual, as in the old *English* word *Click*, from the *Saxon* *Geleccan*, *apprehendere*, *rapere*, to take, or snatch; the *French* word *Crier*, in *English* *Cry*, from the old *Teutonick*, *Greidan*, *Ital.* *Gridare*, *Hisp.* *Gridar*, *Gritar*, *clamare*; and the *English*, *Corcomb*, from the *Saxon* *Geoc-Gum*, compounded of *Gec*, or *Geoc*, in *Kilian* *Gheok*, *præceps*, *temerarius*, *stultus*, *fatuus*, *vecors*, *delirius*, and *Gum*, *homo*.

As more Preparation was required in offering the bloody Sacrifices of the Jews: so had they many more Credences or Tables of Preparation for them than are needful in Christian-Temples; for the one unbloody Eucharistical Oblation consisting, as *Irenæus* observes, only of the Creatures of Bread, and Wine. There were eight Cubits between the North-Wall of the Court of the Temple, and the *Laniæna*, or Place of Slaughter, which was twelve Cubits, and an half broad, on the side of which were hung up the Skins

<sup>a</sup> So in the ancient German or Gothick Tongue, *Goleins*, *salutatio*, is from *Golian*, *salutare*, and *Galaubeins*, *fides*, from *Galaubian*, *credere*.

<sup>b</sup> So the old Saxon and German Noun, *Gerefa*, comes, is contracted in old English into *Grebe*, in the barbarous Latin into *Gratio*, and in the German, *Grave*. So from the A. S. *gepuh*, *austerus* *Gruff*.

<sup>c</sup> *Ducange's* Glossar. *Credentia*, *Abacus*, *Mensa*, in qua vasa ad convivium reponuntur. Vel etiam mensula, quæ vasa Altaris continet. *Ceremoniale Roman.* Lib. I. Sect. 3. describitur pluribus in *Ceremoniali Episcoporum* Lib. I. Cap. 12. *Credentiâ Ecclesiæ*,

of the Victims. <sup>a</sup> Next to it was a place of eight Cubits for eight Marble Tables, upon which were disposed the Joints, or Parts of the washed Bodies of these Victims. Besides these, again were <sup>c</sup> two Tables on the West side of the ascent unto the great Altar, one of which was for the Utensils necessary for the Sacrifice, and the other for the Reception of the pieces of the Victims to be laid, or thrown upon the Altar.

I have made these Remarks for three Reasons; *First*, to move the Clergy of Cathedral, and Parochial Churches to put the aforesaid Rubrick in practice, which in the Communion enjoins the Priest to place the Bread, and Wine upon the Lord's Table. *Secondly*, To persuade them to restore the ancient use of the *Paratorium*, or Table of Preparation, which that Rubrick plainly implies; for the Priest is supposed either to fetch them from some place, or else to have them brought from some place to him, that he may set them on the Altar; and I cannot tell why that should not be another Table in some part of the Church or Chancel to set the Bread, and Wine, and holy Vessels upon, especially where there is no *Sacristy*, or *Vestry*, where they may be conveniently set, till they are brought unto the Priest.

In Cathedrals it seems to be most proper for the Deacon, or another Priest, as the Sacrist commonly is, to bring the Elements to the Bishop, or *Officiating* Priest; but in Parish-Churches, where there is neither Deacon, nor second Priest, the Churchwarden, or other fit Person, might reverently bring them from the *Credence* wheresoever placed, to the Rail, where the Minister might receive them of him to place

---

<sup>a</sup> R. M. Maimonides de secunda lege, seu Manu forti, Parisiis. MDCLXXVIII. p. 23.

<sup>c</sup> P. 10.

them upon the Altar. This Practice would conciliate a greater measure of Reverence, than is often seen, to the Holy Sacrament, and help the People to conceive how the Bread, and Wine is *their* Oblation, and how it is made a Sacrifice by the Ministry of the Priest. *Thirdly*, I have also mentioned the ancient Custom, and true meaning of the *CREDENCE*, to justify the Memory of our English Cyprian, Archbishop *LAUD*, against the False, shall I say, or Ridiculous Charge which was brought against him for *TRAITEROUSLY* endeavouring to alter, and subvert God's true Religion by Law established in this Realm, and instead thereof to set up Popish Superstition, and Idolatry. One main Evidence to prove this Charge, may be seen in these words: *Fourthly*, As this Archbishop introduced an Altar, so likewise a Credentia, or Side-Table into his Chapel, covered with a large Towel, or Linen Cloth, never seen, nor heard of there before his time, whereon the Bread, and Wine, intended to be consecrated at the Sacrament, were first placed with a great deal of Solemnity, before they were brought up to the Altar: after which the Archbishop's Chaplains being about to consecrate the Elements, usually repaired to this Credentia, and taking them from thence into their hands, made three low bowings, or genuflections <sup>b</sup> to the Altar, and coming up unto it, offered up the Bread, and Wine thereat upon their knees, and then laid them on the Altar. Which Ceremonies were there used in the Archbishop's presence sundry times, when the Sacrament was administered, if not by his special direction, yet certainly by his approbation. The other Evidences were taken from <sup>c</sup> Pictures in the Windows of Lambeth Chapel, as that

<sup>a</sup> Prynne's *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 57, 58.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 63.

<sup>c</sup> So he maliciously expresses the Adorations made to God before his Altar.

<sup>d</sup> See his Answer to all these Particulars, Ch. XXXII. of the *History of his Troubles, and Trial.*



of Christ on the Cross; his rising from the Dead; his Ascension; that of the Holy Ghost in form of a Dove descending upon the Apostles; the Pictures of Christ raising up *Lazarus*, and administering his last Supper to his Disciples; placing the Communion-Table Altar-wise, and making a Rail about it; setting Silver Candlesticks with Tapers, and a Silver Bason, and a costly Common-Prayer Book on the Altar; bowings to the Altar; Copes; standing up at *Glory be to the Father*; Organs; an English Bible with a rich Embroidered Crucifix on the cover; Popish Books, as Missals, Pontificals, and Hours; a Book of his own private Prayers, and Devotions extracted out of Popish Offices; the Pictures of St. *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustin*, and *Hierom* in his Gallery; <sup>k</sup> his inserting divers Prayers into the Form of the King's Coronation Oath *verbatim* out of the Roman Pontifical; but above all the *CREDENTIALIA*, for who, saith he, but a professed Papist in Heart, and Affection, durst ever introduce such a gross Popish Innovation into his Chapel, except in Popish Churches in foreign Parts, or the Queen's Chapel here, and that by direction of the Roman Ceremonial, Pontifical, Missal.

And in the Charge that the Scottish Commissioners were allowed to bring against him, to prove him guilty of Popish Innovations in Religion, this was one; <sup>m</sup> That he inverted the Order of the Communion in the Book of England in joining the Spiritual Praise, and Thanksgiving, which is in the Book of England pertinently after the Communion, with the Prayer of Con-

---

<sup>k</sup> This Charge was utterly false.

<sup>l</sup> See the Archbishop's Answer to this Charge in the *History of his Troubles, and Trial*, p. 318.

<sup>m</sup> The Charge of the Scottish Commissioners printed at London in 4<sup>o</sup>. 1641. p. 11, 12, 13. and in *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 34, 35. See the Archbishop's Vindication in the *History of his Troubles, and Trial*, p. 115, 121.

lxxi *A Prefatory Discourse*

secration before the Communion, and that under the Name of Memorial, or Oblation, for no other end, but that the Memorial, or Sacrifice of Praise mentioned in it, may be understood according to the Popish meaning, Bellarm. de Missa Lib. ii. cap. 21. not of the Spiritual Sacrifice, but of the Oblation of the Body of the Lord. The Corporal Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament is also to be found here; for the words of the Mass-Book serving to this purpose, which are sharply censured by Bucer in King Edward's Liturgy, and are not to be found in the Book of England, are taken in here. Almighty God is incalled, that of his Almighty Goodness he may vouchsafe to bless, and sanctifie with his Word, and Spirit these Gifts of Bread, and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ.

Thus was this great, and most worthy Prelate, who defended himself with equal Courage, and Reason, not only most falsely, but in a most ridiculous manner charged with endeavouring to subvert our Religion, and instead thereof to set up Popery in the Realm, by his Enemies of both Kingdoms, at the Bar of both Houses, of which the Great, and Noble Historian writes thus; They charged him with several Articles of High Treason, which if all that was alledged against him had been true, could not have made him guilty of Treason. They accused him of a Design to bring in Popery, and of having Correspondence with the Pope, and such like Particulars, as the Consciences of his greatest Enemies absolved him from. No Man was a greater, or abler Enemy to Popery; no Man a more resolute, and devout Son of the Church of England. He was prosecuted by ° Lawyers assigned for that purpose, out of those, who from their own antipathy to the Church, and Bishops, or from some Disobligations received from him, were sure to bring Pas-

° History of the Rebellion, Vol. II. Book VIII. p. 440.

° Their Names may be seen in Prynne's Canterbury's Doom.

sion, Animosity, and Malice enough of their own; what Evidence soever they had from others. And they treated him with all the Rudeness, Reproach, and Barbarity imaginable, with which his Judges were not displeased.

One would think, after such an Account of his Trial, from so great an Historian, who did not conceal his human Frailties, none should have the Confidence to impeach him over again, and murder his good Name, and Memory as barbarously, as his Unrighteous Accusers, and Judges did his Person. But the <sup>p</sup> Author of the *Rights* abandoned to Truth, and Modesty, lays many of the same false Charges upon him again; for which he cites his most malicious Enemies, *Prynne*, *Whitlock*, and *Rushworth*, though his Innocence had been long clearly vindicated before Men, and Angels, beyond all Contradiction, to the Dishonour of his Old, and the Confusion of his New Enemies, and particularly to the everlasting Shame of the *Rights*, in a Book, which the Author could not be ignorant of, viz. *The History of the Archbishop's Troubles, and Trial*, publish'd by Mr. *Wharton* at London, MDCXCV.

First, he charges him out of *Whitlock's Memoirs*, for patronizing *Chowney's* Book, which averred the Church of Rome to be a true Church, and him, and all other Bishops, who were present at the Censure of *Bastwick* in the *Star-Chamber* for denying openly, that they had their Jurisdiction, as Bishops, from the King, which they asserted they had from God alone; and this he interprets, as their denial of the Supremacy of the King under God. The first of these two Charges is answered most fully by the Archbishop in the *History of his Troubles*, Ch. XLI. p. 391, 392. And how malicious, and full of wilful Misconstruction the Second is, is manifest from

these Words, which the<sup>a</sup> Archbishop spoke in the *Star-Chamber*: Saith he, *Our being Bishops jure divino, by divine Right, takes nothing from the King's Right or Power over us. For though our Office be from God, and Christ immediately, yet may we not exercise that Power, either of Order, or Jurisdiction, but as God hath appointed us; that is, not in his Majesty's or any Christian King's Kingdom, but by, and under the Power of the King given us so to do.*

Then he revives the false Charge of his holding that the Pope was not Antichrist, and of expunging that Title given to him out of printed Books, which the Archbishop answer'd in the 19<sup>th</sup> day of his Tryal, in the XList Ch. p. 390. Then he charges him with affecting to be called *His Holiness*, and *Holy Father*, because the University of Oxford stiled him so in many of their Letters; to which there is a full Answer in the *History of his Troubles*, p. 284. and p. 325. where, because the Author of the RIGHTS is a Civilian, I shall transcribe the holy Father's Words; *That in the Civil Law 'tis frequent to be seen, that not Bishops only one to another, but the great Emperors of the World, have commonly given that Title of SANCTITAS VESTRA to Bishops of meaner Place, than my self.* These things he maliciously produces against him, to shew that his Design was to set up an independent Power in defiance of the Oath of Supremacy, and that for that reason he was against the Pope's Supremacy, because he had a mind to set up an *English Supremacy*.

Lastly, he falsely charges him with causing the Picture of the Trinity, where God the Father was drawn like a little Old Man, to be painted afresh in his Chapel at *Lambeth*, with other Pictures to advance *Priestcraft*. For this he cites his great Ene-

---

<sup>a</sup> The Second Volume of the Remains of W. Laud, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Printed at London, 1700. p. 68.



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* lxxiii

my *Prynne* in his *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 463. But the Charge was false, as, if he did not know it before, he may see in the *History of his Troubles*, Ch. XXXIII. p. 317. where he will find it proved, that there was no Picture of God the Father in the Chapel at *Lambeth*. He farthermore saith, He was the Darling of the Papists, excepting that in the point of Independent Power he set up for himself; and what will not a Man say, that can say this without blushing? Contrary to the History of the Times, the Blessed Martyr's immortal Works, his last Speech, and last Will, and Testament, and the Testimonies of Mr. *Whiston*, and Mr. *Evelyn* in the *History of his Troubles*, p. 616. But of all the Reproach he hath had the Impudence to blacken his Memory with, none is more false, and malicious, than that which he couches in these Words: *Not that he was, to do him Justice, for advancing the Power of the Pope, or cared for the Romish Religion more than any other.* The Name of the Devil signifies Calumniator, and the Scriptures call him the Father of Lyes, and the Accuser of the Brethren, and I leave it to the Conscience of this Calumniator, if he have any left, to consider, whether this slandering Reflection, and the many other Lyes, and false Accusations he hath recited of this great Man, and most excellent Prelate, can proceed from any thing but Diabolical Inspiration, or, which is not much better, a devilish Spirit of Calumny, which enforms and poisons his wicked Mind. If any Man think this Chastisement of him too severe, let him consider what Censure he deserves, who could bring himself to revive so many Calumnies upon the Memory of that Just Man, after the true History of his Tryal was published, which he left behind for his Vindication to the whole Christian World against all the Enemies, the Devil had raised up against him. The noble Historian, who as I must observe again, was

lxxiv      *A Prefatory Discourse*

not sparing, or partial in noting his Infirmities, <sup>r</sup> tells us, That his Memory deserves a particular Celebration, that his Learning, Piety, and Virtue hath been attained by very few; and that the greatest of his Infirmities are common to all, even to the best of Men. But it is through his Sides that the Writer of the Rights wounds all, whom he calls *High-Church*; he blackens his Memory to reproach them, whom he treats in Derision, and calls by Names of the utmost Scandal, and Contempt. He loads them with many, invidious, false Charges, <sup>r</sup> particularly in labouring to have the Word *Church* signifie the Clergy only, in exclusion of the People, as they do in Popish Countries.

Whereas the Church being a Society, the Name of it is variously used, as in other Societies, sometimes in the most proper Sense for the Clergy, and People, as in that of St. Cyprian, *A Church is the People united to their Bishop, and the Flock, adhering to their Pastor*. But then again by a Metonymy common to the Names of other Societies, it is used sometimes less properly, first for the People only, or the Flock without the Clergy, as in *Acts xx. 28. Take heed unto your selves, and unto all the Flock, whereof the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to feed the Church of God*. And secondly, for the Governours of the Church, as in a Council, or Consistory, as in *Matth. xviii. 17. Tell it unto the Church, but if he neglect to hear the Church*; and in this Sense hath it been used in all Ages of Christianity long before Popery was in the World, to signifie the Clergy, or ruling part of the Church. Thus, I conceive, it is more especially to be understood in St. John's Salutation *unto the seven Churches which are in Asia*, that

History of the Rebel. B. VIII. p. 442.

<sup>r</sup> Preface, p. 87, 88.

<sup>r</sup> Illi sunt Ecclesia plebs Sacerdoti adjuncta, & Pastori suo Grex adherens. Epist. LXVI.

is

is, to the Angels of the seven Churches in *Asia*. So it is used in the Sixth Canon of the first General Council. *Let the ancient Customs be observed, that the Bishop of Alexandria have the Authority of all those that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, because the same usage is observed by the Bishop of Rome. In like manner are the Privileges preserved to the Churches* [that is, to the Bishops of the Churches] *of Antioch, and other Provinces.* The word is so used in the XX<sup>th</sup> of the XXXIX Articles, first in the Title, *Of the Authority of the Church*; and then in the Article it self, *The Church hath power to decree Rights, and Ceremonies, and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain, &c.* So Article XXXIV. *Every particular, or National Church, hath Authority to ordain, change, and abolish Ceremonies, &c.* In this Sense we also say the Articles, Canons, and Homilies of the Church of *England*, that is, the Articles, Canons, &c. made by the Clergy of the Church. In this Sense also it is often used in our Laws, as in the first Article of *Magna Charta*, where the King grants for himself, and his Heirs for ever, *That the Church of England shall be free, and have all her whole Rights, and Liberties inviolable.* By the same usual Figure of Speech, *House*, or *Family*, signifies the Master, and Father of the Family; *City*, the Mayor, and Aldermen of the City; *College*, the Master of the College; and under the Name of *Army*, we often mean only the General; or General, and Commanders, as when we speak of the *Orders of the Army*; and therefore there is no more *Popery*, or *Priestcraft* in the Clergy, when they speak of themselves under the Name of the *Church*; than *Master-craft* in the Father of a Family, when he speaks of himself under the Name of the *Family*; or *King-craft* in a King when he speaks of himself under the Name of the *Kingdom*; or *General-craft* when the General speaks of himself under the Name of the *Army*: But when Clergy-

men

men do so<sup>a</sup>, he spitefully, as well as scurrilously, saith it is not only errant Priestcraft, but as ridiculous, as if the Drummers, and Trumpeters should call themselves the Army exclusively of all others, and by means of that endeavour to get the whole Power into their hands; and represent every one as an Enemy to the Army, who will not come into the Cheat.

His Spite to the Clergy makes him plentiful in opprobrious Names. In another place he compares them to <sup>a</sup> *Trap-setters*; \* in another he saith, it is their Interest to have Religion corrupted; and somewhere he saith, that the Christian, which is the *best* Religion, hath the *worst* Priests. And because the Church, according to the Wisdom, and Practice of other Societies, hath been always wont, without respect to Families, or Persons, to take fit Men tho' of lower Extraction, and Fortunes into her Service; he therefore reproaches the whole Body of the Clergy for the sake of those among them, who are of meaner Families, in such a manner as equally reflects upon all sorts of Societies, and Orders of Men at Court, in the City, the Camp, the Senate, at the Bar, and on the Bench. This Reflection also casts pharisaical Contempt upon Christ, and his Apostles; and were not his Hatred to the Clergy above his Reason, he could not act so contrary to his Character, as a Christian, a *Son of a Priest*, and a Civilian, who should know, it was provided by the Laws of the Empire, that if a *Slave* were made a Bishop, or Priest, he should be *ipso facto* free. Had we Slavery, or Villenage in use among us, I presume it would be no dishonour to the Church, or her Hierarchy, if a *Zamolxis*, a *Tiro*, a *Terence*, an *Epictetus*, or an *Aesop* were for their excellent Gifts taken into the number of the Clergy, and of the Servants

---

<sup>a</sup> Pref. p. lxxviii.

<sup>a</sup> P. 24.

<sup>a</sup> P. 190.

<sup>a</sup> *Cyvil's Answer to Julian*, lib. VI.



of Men made, or if he will give me leave so to speak, Consecrated into Ministers of God. Priests made of Slaves in ancient Times were thought no dishonour to the Priesthood, as is plain from the LXXXII<sup>d</sup> of the Apostolick Canons, which tells us, That a Slave was not to be made a Clergy-man without the Consent of his Lord. Such were *Epaphras*, or *Epaphroditus*, St. Paul's <sup>2</sup> Fellow-labourer, and Fellow-soldier, and <sup>3</sup> *Onesimus* his Son, his Brother, and his Bowels. He cannot take it amiss if I send him once more to a Sovereign Pontiff, as well as a Sovereign Prince, I mean to *Julian* to be better instructed. For he, though as much concerned for the Honour of the Priesthood, as any Man ever was, writes at another rate in the *Frágment* of one of his Epistles :

<sup>b</sup> *I will (saith he) that in all Cities the best Men be chosen Priests, especially those who are most eminent for their Piety to the Gods, and their Charity towards Men, be they poor, or be they rich; for there ought to be no difference in this affair between those of noble, and those of obscure Originals, nor ought any humble Man to be rejected for his Obscurity. Wherefore let any Man be chosen a Priest, who is qualified with these two fundamental Virtues, the Love of the Gods, and the Love of Men.*

One reason which St. Chrysostom <sup>c</sup> gives for declining the Episcopal Order was this: *Least he being of a rich, and splendid Family, the People should suspect the Bishops ordained him upon that account. Whereas (saith he) Christ called Fishers, and Tent-Makers, and Publicans [ἐν τῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἀρχιτῷ] to this Principality. So in the Tract de Cæna Domini: Sic tu domine, Armentarios statim facis Prophetas, &c. So*

<sup>2</sup> Phil. ii. 25.      <sup>3</sup> Colloss. iv. 9. Philem. 9, 10. Balsam. and Zonar. on LXXXII. Can. Apost.

<sup>b</sup> Ἐσὼ φησὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀλλοτρίῳ βασιλεῖ, &c.

<sup>c</sup> De Sacerdotio lib. II. p. 67. Edit. à doctiss. viro Joan. Hughes Cantabrigiæ M. DC. X.

# lxxviii     *A Prefatory Discourse*

thou, O Lord, in a Moment makest Herdsmen Prophets; Shepherds Kings; Publicans Apostles; and Fishermen Doctors of thy Church. And any one, who is pleased to read how <sup>d</sup> *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* behaved himself in the choice of a Bishop of COMANA will find how little he regarded Extraction, though he was himself Noble. For after long enquiry for one, that was most worthy, he chose one *Alexander* for his great Virtues, who in appearance was but a Collier, though upon farther examination of him, after he had preferred him to all others, he found he was a Man of a good Family, who disguised himself, and his most beautiful Form under that fordid and smutty Occupation, that he might with more convenience devote himself to Christian Philosophy, and avoid the dangerous Temptations, to which his Form and Stature would otherwise have exposed himself and others.

As for Synods, or Councils, he saith, <sup>e</sup> *There never was one since the times of the Apostolick Purity, that hath not determined something or other in prejudice of the true Religion; by which undoubtedly he means his own.* He condemns them for a Reason, for which all Senates, and Assemblies of Men must likewise be condemned, viz. <sup>f</sup> *Because the greatest part of Mankind are apt to prefer their private Interest before any motive whatsoever, especially when they act in Bodies: For then Reputation and Honour, Shame and Disgrace, which frequently influence single Persons, quite lose their force.* He saith, <sup>g</sup> *They have, generally speaking, been composed of the most ambitious, crafty, and designing Men, better vers'd in the Arts of Fawning, and Flattering, than in the Knowledge of Religion.* What an English Synod saith of General Councils made up of

---

<sup>d</sup> Vita Greg. Thaumaturgi per Greg. Nyssen. oper. Tom. II. P. 993, 994. *Græc. Hist. Eccl. lib. 8. c. 12.* R. 191, 192.

<sup>f</sup> P. 164.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

uncharitable, ambitious, and malicious Men (alluding to some such particular unhappy Synods) <sup>h</sup> he makes the Character of all, and falsely saith it was the Opinion of *Gregory Nazianzen*; whereas what that Holy Father wrote was only written of the *Council of Constantinople* in Sickneſs, <sup>i</sup> Chagrin, and Diſcontent, where he had not been well treated, and never was deſigned by him for a general Character, or Rule. He ſaith, that *he was at ſeveral Councils, particularly that he was at that General, and Creed-making one of Constantinople*. Where the Reader may obſerve where his Core at Councils lies; it was a *Creed-making Council*; it made that Creed which is in the ancient Liturgies, and which our Anceſtors uſed a Thouſand Years ago, and we ſtill uſe in the *Communion Service*, and *Gregory* was one of the chief *Creed-makers* in it; and if his Teſtimony is good againſt the Heats, and paſſionate Debates which happen'd in the Council about himſelf, it is as good for the *Creed*. Nay, if he is a *teſtable Perſon*, his Teſtimony muſt be taken in behalf of the firſt General Council of *Nice*; for he was a great Impugner of the *Arians*, of whom our Author, and the *Theiſtical Club* are great Admirers, and a zealous Defender of the *Nicene Faith*. He profeſſes ſo much in his <sup>k</sup> 49th Oration, tranſlated by *Ruffinus*, but more eſpecially in his 21ſt Oration, in Praise of that *Creed-making Rascal* **ATHANASIVS**; where he calls the Synod the *Holy Synod*, and the Fathers the *Holy Fathers*; and therefore if he is a good Witneſs, there

<sup>h</sup> P. 195.

<sup>i</sup> La 55. Dans laquelle il declare, qu'il craint toutes les Aſſemblies Eccleſiaſtiques, parceque il n'a jamais vu dit il, la fin d'aucun Concile, qui ait été heureuſe, & agreable, & qui n'a augmenté le mal, plutot que le diminuer, Mais cette maxime qu'il a écrite étant Chagrin contre le Concile de Constantinople, qui ne l'avoit traitté aſſez favorablement, ne doit paſſer pour une Regle, mais ſeulement pour un eſpèce, de reſſentiment, qui eſt échappé à Saint Gregoire. Dupin. Nouvelle Biblioth. Tome ſecond. 4°. p.220.

<sup>k</sup> Oper. Vol. I. p. 727.

was one Synod at least, and that a General one, which determined nothing in prejudice of the true Religion. Nay, if his Testimony is to be taken, the *Sacerdotal*, and *Regal* Power are distinct from, and independent of one another, as he may see in the second Tome of the *Dignity of the Episcopal Order and Office* in a Letter to a Serjeant at Law.

In the rest of the Chapter he hath raked together out of several Writers a very invidious account of the ill Conduct of Councils, and of the Divisions, and Quarrels of Bishops in them, with his own Reflections, and Applications; which will signifie nothing to wise, and serious Men, who in this case can consider the difference between the *Men*, and the *Priests*; as in others of the like nature between the *Men*, and the *Senators*, or between the *Man*, and the *King*. All he hath maliciously scraped and patched together on this melancholy Subject, amounts to no more than this, that Priests, and Bishops are Men, and not Angels, Men of like Passions, and Infirmities with others; and that every one of them may say, as *Siracides* makes *Solomon* speak of himself: *I my self also am a mortal Man, like to all, and the Off-spring of him, that was first made of Earth. Priests therefore like Kings, and Princes, and Senators, and Judges, are at best but frail Men; and our Author's way of arguing against them in their Single, or Synodical Capacity from their Miscarriages, is in effect to impeach the Wisdom of God in making mortal Men Priests, and to argue not Christianity, not the Church only, but Civil Government, and Rulers out of the World. Julian the Apostate, who knew the Divisions, and Parties, and Quarrels that were, and had been among Christian Priests both in and out of Synods better than our Author, was a better Reasoner, than to make use of this Argument against them. He knew very well, that this way of representing any Sort, or Rank, or Order of Mortals had no*  
sense,



sense, though much of popular Fallacy in it, and in reality was nothing but a Satyr on the Nature of Man; and the Differences among the Clergy in, or out of Councils never had that effect upon the Christians of ancient Times, as to make them despise their Order, or disobey their Authority, much less to suspect that Christian Priesthood was but Priestcraft. There were then no such Monsters among Christians, no such infernal Enemies to Priesthood, as our Author, and his *Gang*. For they did not only consider, that Priests were Men subject to divers Temptations, and capable, like other Christians, of committing Sins of all sorts, but believed also, that as the Devils, those Enemies of Christ, were more diligent to tempt Christians, than other Men; so they were busier with Priests, than other Christians; but never thought the Priesthood, or the Authority belonging to it, ought to be affected with the Miscarriages, or Fall of their Priests. At his way of speaking, what a fine Harangue might a Learned Jew, or *Mahometan* make against Christianity from the former, and later Divisions of Christians, out of Christian Writers, with particular Reflections upon these Times; in which, to the great Dishonour of the Christian Religion, but without being a real Argument against the Truth of it; *Christian Nations*, and Kingdoms have for Twenty Years been sheathing their Swords in one another's Bowels, to say no worse, in most *Unchristian Wars*, without a Sword being drawn in any part of the Unbelieving World.

His Words also in the Mouth, or from the Pen of a *Saducee*, or of a *Theistical Jew*, if there had been any such, would have made a fine Flourish of no Force against the *Jewish Clergy*; to persuade his Readers, if he could, that the *Mosaick Priesthood*, and Institutions were all *Priestcraft*; and that *Moses*, (as a *Theist* lately said) was a Cunning Fellow, who made himself *King*, and his Brother a *Priest*. The Golden  
Calf;

## Ixxxii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

Calf; the Sons of *Eli*, those Sons of *Belial*, who made themselves so vile; the Priests taking strange Wives in their Captivity; their polluting the Table of the Lord after it; all the Complaints in the Prophets against them, particularly in their *Synodical* Capacity, as Members of the *Sanhedrim*, would have been matter of a much more plausible Harangue against the Priesthood then, than all our Author hath collected now; yet for all this, and much more, that might be added, the *Jewish* Princes, and People, still venerated their Priests for the sake of their Office, and *that* for the sake of its Divine Institution; and had any of them been so wicked as this Author, to write after his reproachful manner against the Priests, the whole Congregation would have stoned him to Death.

Our Lord, who knew the Wickedness of the Priests, and that he should be crucified by them, never spoke against them as *Priests*, but was subject to them, and bid those he cured go, and shew themselves to them, and offer their Gifts according to the Law of *Moses*. Whatever He, or his Apostles, said of them as Sinners, they never spoke against the *Priesthood*, or against them as Priests; and therefore it was blaspheming of him, and slandering of them, in their Table-talk, to say, that the Author of the *Rights* in speaking against Priests, did no more than Christ and his Apostles did.

But to proceed, his way of exposing, and deriding Ecclesiastical Synods, is in effect Libelling all Temporal *Senates*, *States*, *Dyets*, and *Parliaments*, and arguing against these, as well as them. He cannot but know that the *Senate* of *Rome*, when a Commonwealth, was so corrupt, that they would have sold the City, and Citizens, if they could have found any to buy them, and that *Tiberius* the Emperor, when he went out of the Senate House, used to say aloud in *Greek*, *O homines ad servitutem paratos!* And *Petrinus*

*in Answer to The Rights, &c. lxxxiii*

tronius in his Verses of the Civil Wars, wrote thus  
of Senate and People,

——— *Emptique Quirites*  
*Ad prædam, strepitumque lucri Suffragia vertunt*  
*Venalis populus, Venalis Curia patrum.*

He knows how the Jewish Sanhedrim, which was their Senate, killed the Prophets, and crucified their Saviour, and murdered his Disciples. But there is no need of having recourse to Jewish, and Heathenish Assemblies of Men upon this unhappy Subject, Christian Histories being full of Examples of such Meetings, wherein ambitious, and designing Men, and Men of the worst Principles, and Morals, have made most fierce, and furious Contentions; formed bloody Parties, turned all Civil Order into Confusion, and involved their Countries in Broils, Wars, and Desolation; Reputation, and Honour, Shame, and Disgrace, which, as our Author speaks, frequently influence single Persons, having quite lost their Force in such Bodies of Men. I need not go abroad for Instances, the direful History of the Parliament, that begun in 1641, is a Proof, a deplorable domestick Proof, of what I say against him for asserting, that the Laity can have no motive, no temptation to abuse or corrupt Religion to advance their temporal Interest, and it will be a Testimony against him in all Ages to come. And an Enemy of Parliaments, after his ill Logick, and worse Example, may say in his Words; *The Conduct of Parliaments is a sufficient Demonstration against all their Pretences of doing Justice, since that cardinal, and benign Virtue is likelier to be found any where than in such Assemblies; and it would be strange if Right should be found to dwell, where Justice and Humanity are seldom to be found.* Nay, if our Author desires more Examples, let him consult Prynne, his

## lxxxiv    *A Prefatory Discourse*

dear Oracle *Prynne*, in his <sup>1</sup> Preface to the *Abridgement of the Records*, and in his *Seasonable, &c. Vindication of the Liberties of English Freemen*, and there he will find great plenty.

Nevertheless, though Parliaments have sometimes been so factious in themselves, so unjust to private Persons, and so mischievous to the Kingdom, as he represents, yet all true English-men love the National Constitution of Parliaments, and honour them, and submit to their Laws, and other Determinations, which they make, tho' often after much Heat, and mighty Discord, and Contention among themselves.

In like manner the ancient Christian Clergy, and Laity submitted to the Laws, and Determinations of true, and lawful Councils, and Synods, which they made sometimes after long, and great Debates, and Contentions; because they knew, that the care of the Church was committed in whole, as well as in part, jointly, as well as severally to the Bishops, as Governours of it under Christ, and that it belongs to them to make Canons for the good Government of the Church, and determine all Disputes and Differences arising therein. But our Author with his usual Modesty calls Canons, and Determinations,

<sup>1</sup> Parliaments now and then, either out of Hatred, Envy, Passion, or compliance with some potent, ambitious, popular swaying Lords, and Grandees, have most unjustly, illegally Condemned, Executed, Banished, Fined, Sentenced, Oppressed sundry Innocent, and some well-deserving Persons without just Cause, Trial, or due Conviction of any real Crimes.

That all such Parliaments and ambitious Self-seekers in them, who under a pretence of publick Reformation, the Peoples Ease, Welfare, &c.

We may discern that as Parliaments are the best of all Courts, and Councils, when duly Summoned, Convened, Constituted, Ordered, and kept within their legal Bounds: So they become the greatest Mischiefs, and Grievances to the Kingdom, when like the Ocean they overflow their Banks, or degenerate, and become through Sedition, Malice, Faction, Fear, or Infatuation by Divine Justice, Promoters of corrupt, sinister Ends, or Accomplishers of, &c.

*Impositions*



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* lxxxv

*Impositions* upon the People; and so, if he pleases, he may say that the Apostles, and Elders, who <sup>m</sup> met in Council at *Jerusalem*, and the Holy Ghost, who was present with them, *imposed* upon the *Gentiles* Abstinence from Meats offered to Idols, from Blood, and from things Strangled, and from Fornication. Nay, if it will do him any good, I can prove it for him from the original word ΕΠΙΘΕΣΘΑΙ. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us to impose upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.* Indeed all Orders, Commands, and Decrees of lawful Superiours are *Impositions*, and the Canons, and Injunctions of the Church are in no other sense such, than all the Acts, and Edicts, and definitive Sentences of Kings, or Senates, or Courts of last Appeal in all the Nations of the Earth. This new way of arguing against Ecclesiastical Synods, and Councils, from the Contentions which happen in them, hath a farther prospect, than most Readers will at first discern. For as the Men who make a Flourish with it, are Enemies of the Clergy, and as their *Speaker*, our Author plainly tells us, would have the whole Affair of Religion managed by Lay-hands: So when they find their Opportunity, they'll turn it upon the first Ministers of the Gospel, *the Apostles*, who they will have the Impudence to say, *first pretended to the Spirit to Sanctifie what they did*; and to give Colour to what they say. They'll ask how the Spirit could be with Men, who had such shameful Divisions among themselves; sometimes for Superiority, who should be the greatest; sometimes for Trifles, as *Paul* with *Barnabas*; and sometimes about Matters of Religion, as <sup>n</sup> *Paul* with *Peter*, whom he withstood to his Face? Nay, to discredit Christianity, as much as they can, they'll declaim with all their Wit, and Malice upon the Divisions, Factions, and Conten-

---

<sup>m</sup> Acts xv.

<sup>n</sup> Galat. ii. 11.

lxxxvi      *A Prefatory Discourse*

tions in the Church of *Corinth*, planted by the Apostle himself. These Scorners, when it will serve their turn, will make them, as well as the Quarrels, and Contentions in Councils, a common place for their Scurrility; and *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, and I of Christ*, shall be an *Herculean* Argument with them, that *Lay-men* would make much better Church-Governours, than *Priests*.

° He saith, That by the Account which the Orthodox give of the many *Arian* Councils, one would think they were speaking of *Devils*, and not of *Men*. And let any Man read the Ecclesiastical Historians, particularly but <sup>p</sup> three short Chapters in the First Book of the Ecclesiastical History of *Socrates*, and the xvi<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Fourth, which he artfully conceals, and then let him judge, if, for their Cruelty and Lying, they deserved not to be so spoken of. *Arsenius's* Hand is enough to justify the most severe Speeches of them, without mentioning their barbarous Persecutions, and Cruelties in the *Arian* Reigns. Besides, the *Faithful* always believed that Hereticks were acted, and inspired by the Devils; and so, according to the Jewish, and Christian Doctrine relating to the power those wicked Spirits have over wicked Men, I make no difficulty to speak of the Author of the *Rights*, and such Writers, as of Men, who are acted by the Devils: For should Satan himself write Books by the Hands of Men, he could not write with more Spite, and Venom than they have done against the Priesthood, and the Church.

He cites a most false, and malicious Character of the first General Council of *Nice*, out of *Marvel's* Historical Essay of Councils; who was, as the Reader may perceive by the Citation it self, an utter Enemy to the *Nicene* Faith. Such also, or almost such, are many of the other Writers, which he cites

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* lxxxvii

in that Chapter, either utter Enemies, or not true Friends to the *Consubstantial Doctrine*; and how much *Marvel* hath misrepresented that Council, may be seen in the account which <sup>a</sup> *Eusebius* hath given of it in a few short Chapters, or that which <sup>r</sup> *Socrates* hath given of it out of *Eusebius*, in the Life of *Constantine*; as also out of *Sozomen*, Lib. I. Cap. XVII, XVIII, &c. Those who do not understand the Originals may see in the *English* <sup>t</sup> Translation of the Ecclesiastical Historians, how *Eusebius* calls the Meeting of the Council the Work of God, and compares the Bishops of which it consisted, to a Garland made of the finest Flowers from all Parts, and bound together with the Bond of Peace. Some of them he saith were adorned with the Word of Wisdom; others were venerable for the Gravity of their Lives, and their very great Sufferings; and others for their Modesty, and Moderation: And of the Three hundred and eighteen Fathers who were assembled in that Council, all but five agreed in that *Nicene* Confession of Faith. There they will find what respect, and deference the Emperor paid to them, as to his <sup>t</sup> Spiritual Fathers, and Superiors, and that the great Animosities, and Contentions he found at first among them, did not lessen his Veneration for them; for he was <sup>u</sup> thoroughly instructed in the Christian Religion, and did not only consider that Christians, and Christian Priests were Men of Passions, and subject to be tempted to Strife by the Devils; but also looked upon Sects, and Parties, and Schisms among themselves, as <sup>w</sup> Arguments for

<sup>a</sup> De vita Constant. lib. III. cap. iv, v, vi, vii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiii.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. I. Cap. vii, viii.

<sup>t</sup> Reprinted at London, 1709.

<sup>u</sup> Euseb. de vita Const. Lib. III. Cap. xxiii.

<sup>w</sup> Sozom. Eccles. Hist. Lib. I. Cap. iii.

<sup>y</sup> See the Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in Answer to her Adversaries, who reproach her with the *English* Heresies, and Schisms; Printed for Walter Kettilby, in St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1706.

# lxxxviii    *A Prefatory Discourse*

the Truth of Christianity, because they were foretold. Indeed their Divisions was neither matter of Wonder, or Scandal to the Wise among the *Greeks*, who knew that there were numerous Divisions among the Philosophers, and all other Professors of Arts and Sciences, and therefore the Divisions among the Bishops in the Council of *Nice*, was no bar to the Conversion of two Philosophers, who came with as much Prejudice, as Curiosity, to hear their Debates; and if our Author's Spite to Priesthood would have let him, he might have learned more Manners, if not more Religion, than to treat Christian Synods, as he hath done, from a wise, and ingenuous Pagan, the Philosopher \* *Themistius*, who addressing himself to the *Arian* Emperor *Valens*, to persuade him to moderate his cruel Persecution of the *Faithful*; told him, *He ought not to admire at the Disagreement of Opinions among Christians*, which was but small, if compared with the Multitude, and Confusion of Opinions amongst the *Greeks*, among whom there were above Three hundred Sects. Nay, he pray'd him to consider, that the most excellent, and useful Arts had never arrived to such Perfection, but by difference of Judgment, and Strife among the Artists themselves; nay, that Philosophy, the Mother of all good Arts, had risen from small beginnings to such a height of Perfection by Differences, and Contentions among Learned Men.

But nothing will satisfy these Men, whose Reasons are perverted, and whose Souls are poisoned to such a degree, with the *Anti-Nicene* Venom against Priesthood and Priests. If God had thought fit, instead of Men to make *Angels* Priests, that would not have pleased them. Then they would have arraigned his Wisdom at the Bar of their

---

\* *Socras. H. E. Lib. IV. Cap. xix.*



*in Answer to The Rights, &c. lxxxix*

Reason, for making Spirits Priests, who had none of our Passions, and by consequence could have no Compassion for our Infirmities. If they had preached, and prayed among them, as we do, and administred the same Sacraments, and come to visit them in their Houses, Familiarity would have bred the same Contempt. When they preached up Repentance, Mortification, and Self-denial, they would have cavilled, and said, they preached what they did not understand; that they knew not our animal Frame, and carnal Constitution; and that it was unreasonable to hear such Doctrines from those, who did not understand *Flesh, and Blood*. Had they preached up *Non-Resistance*, they would have said they were Devils, who out of Spite to Men, the noblest part of God's Creation, had a mind to make all Mankind Slaves. Had they sometimes eat, and drank with them, as the Angels did with *Abraham, and Lot*, they would have said they were *Gluttonous, and Wine-bibbers*; but had they conversed with them, neither eating Bread, nor drinking Wine, they would have said, they were *Austere Devils*. Had they made Canons, especially Penitential Canons, for the Government of the Church, and put them in Execution upon stubborn, and contumacious Sinners, they would have said they were *Abaddons*; that *their pretended Power; clashed with the Civil Magistrate's Power; that it took from them the Power of protecting their Subjects; that they took the Practice of it from the Heathen Priests; that it set up IMPERIUM in IMPERIO, and was sufficient to enslave all Mankind*. Had they pretended to bind, and loose Sinners, then they would have said they could not be good but evil Spirits, *who usurped the Prerogative, and invaded the incommunicable Rights of God; assuming a Power to themselves of Damning, and Saving, and making God no more than their Executioner*. If they had met together, and framed any Confession of Faith, especially

ally in the Words of that of the *Nicene-Council*, though they had framed it with the same Harmony, and Agreement in which the good Angels live in Heaven, they would have <sup>r</sup> said, *That it was an Imposition on the Christian World, not being contained in exprefs Words of Scripture; that they undermined the Fabrick of Christianity by it; that they departed from the general Rules of their Religion in imposing of it, and violated our Saviour's Institution of a Church, not subject to any Additions in Matters of Faith; and that as they had no Idea of that Doctrine, so it was nothing to them,* <sup>r</sup> who are to judge for themselves, and act according to their Judgment: And had they enjoined any Rites, or Ceremonies, they would have said, <sup>a</sup> *They were for Shows, and laid stress upon Impertinencies, which no ways influenced a good Life.*

He censures the Clergy for condemning *K. Henry VIII.* for alienating the Church Lands, and those who possess them, as guilty of Sacrilege, for withholding them from the Church; and so he might have censured many learned Lay-men too. And the reason he gives for censuring or rather ridiculing of them is this; <sup>b</sup> that they are now in the hands of the Church, and have been ever since the People were possessed of them, because the People in the Scriptures are called the Church. So the People of the City are called *the City*, and if any of them should possess themselves of the *City-Lands*, they would be in the City still. So when an intruding President, and Fellows of *Madg. College* in *Oxford*, sacrilegiously shared the *Founder's Gold* among them, the Gold was in the College still. But if for *Church Lands*, we put *Priests-Lands*, or *Bishops-Lands*, his Sophism will appear to a Child, though he hopes to deceive Men with it; and as long as our Bishops, and Priests enjoy the remainder of the *Church-Lands*,

<sup>r</sup> P. 196.<sup>a</sup> Pref. p. lxxxv.<sup>b</sup> P. 212.<sup>b</sup> P. 215. these

these Men, if permitted, will be always thus writing against them. A *Stipendiary Ministry* subject to a *Staff*, and a *pair of Shoes*, is what they design to bring about by all their *Invectives* against the *Clergy*: And as they *malign* the *Church* for her *Lands*; so they hate her *Synods* for the sake of her *Doctrine*, and are always for the same cause barking at the *Universities*, because they also have *Lands*, and are the *Seminaries* of the *Church*.

The narrow Bounds of a Preface will not give me leave to shew the many false turns he hath given to *Church-History* in this Chapter, and make the Reflections, which the Authors, he hath cited against Ecclesiastical Synods, as well as what he cites, deserve. I will only say, I am sorry, and am ashamed to find that any Divines of the Church of *England* should write in such manner, as to deserve Praises from him; and I hope it will be matter of Humiliation, and Repentance to them, when they find themselves adorn'd for writing such things by such Men, whose Commendations are Flatteries, whose Praises are Dishonour, and whose Characters the more favourable they are, are the greater Scandal and Disgrace. Indeed it would be worth the while for some that have time, to make Remarks on all the Citations of his Book. Some he would find cited out of Authors, who were known Enemies to Revealed Religion; others which have been answered without taking notice of the Answers. Others he would find to be the Errors of mistaken, and well-meaning Men; and others of Clergy-men, who to serve a Design, have written things inconsistent with their Characters, and Profession, as *Priests*. Others again would appear to be but rash, and passionate Discharges of Men, who wrote in haste, and heat; and others, which he triumphs in citing, would be

found to be but Singularities of a few opining Writers, who are as much in love with their own dear Notions, as *Narcissus* was with his own Form. In the last place, others will be found to be nothing but the Effusions of Bile, and Venom against the Fathers of the *Greek*, and *Latin* Church upon the account of the *Nicene*, or *Constantinopolitan* Confession, of which I will give one Example. <sup>d</sup> Mr. *Le Clerc* (saith he) than whom there never was a more impartial, or abler Judge, gives us a short yet lively Picture of these Times: “ *Weak Princes, as far*  
“ *from being good as wise, assembled a pack of paltry*  
“ *Greeks, who had spent their Lives in the Art of*  
“ *cavilling about Words, without the least knowledge*  
“ *in Things; so very fond of wrangling, that they*  
“ *were eternally in Feuds among themselves. To*  
“ *these were added some few from the West, more*  
“ *stupid, and ignorant indeed, but not a whit more*  
“ *honest; who after much scandalous quarreling,*  
“ *did at last by their own Authority establish cer-*  
“ *tain unintelligible Propositions, in such Terms as*  
“ *were for the most part very improper, which the*  
“ *Vulgar implicitly revered, as most Heavenly*  
“ *Truths. This, as severe as it seems, is softer*  
“ *than what the Great *Episcopius* says of the Councils,*  
“ *that they were led on by Fury, Faction, and Mad-*  
“ *ness. I need make no Reflections on these modest*  
Characters of the Emperors, and the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers of the IV. and V. Century. Not to mention *Theodosius* junior, and *Marcian*; *Constantine* the Great, and *Theodosius* the Great, are here set forth as great Fools, and very wicked Princes; and the Fathers of the two first general Councils, not to mention any of their great Names, were a pack of paltry, cavilling, stupid Fellows; Boobies, and

<sup>d</sup> P. 199.<sup>e</sup> *Ars Critic. cap. 4.* See more to the same purpose by the same Author, cited by the Learned Dr. *Cave* in his Vindication of *Eusebius* from Arianism against *Le Clerc*, p. 1.



Knaves, that knew nothing but how to quarrel, and broul. Good God ! that the Christian World should be misled for so many Ages by such worthless, ignorant sort of Men ; that our Reformers, and all our Learned Divines since the Reformation, should retain such Veneration for them, <sup>f</sup> and not only declare that their Confession of Faith, with the Apostles Creed, and the Creed commonly called the Creed of St. *Athanasius* ought to be received, and believed, because they may be proved by Holy Scripture ; but also make them a part of our Religious Worship. This is their secret intolerable Grievance ; This, and absolute *Non-resistance*, is that which provokes them to write with so much Scorn, and Bitterness against the Clergy. Would the *English* Convocation but damn the Creeds, which assert the *Holy Trinity*, and the *Non-resisting* Doctrine, then these Men would *invert* their *Style*, and write of our Order, as most Divine, and say as glorious things of us all, as for their own purpose they say of some.

It would require a great deal of Time, and Paper to shew our Author's Fallacies, and Contradictions, and how under the Name of *High Church* he hath written from one end of his Book to the other against the *Church of England*, contrary to her Doctrine, and Discipline, in her Articles, Canons, and Homilies, in which she asserts the *Power of the Keys*, and the Clergy to have that Power, as the Bishop of *Sarum* writes in the Preface to his *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England* : *But our Church still owns the Power of the Keys, which is not only Doctrinal* (Art. 33.) *when the Mercies of God are declared, or his Judgments denounced ; but it is also Authoritative and Ministerial, by which all Christians are either admitted to, or rejected from the Privileges of Church-Communion, and their Sins are*

---

<sup>f</sup> Art. viii.

bound, or loosed. *With this we assert the Pastors of the Church are vested.* That the Pastors of the Church are vested by God with such a Power is plain from the Sense, and Practice of the Christians, as express'd by <sup>s</sup> *Tertullian* in these Words: *We Christians are a Corporation, or Society of Men, most strictly united by the same Religion, by the same Rites of Worship, and animated by one, and the same Hope. When we come to the Publick Service of God, we come like an Army, as if we were to storm Heaven by the Force of our Prayers; and this Force is grateful Violence to God. — We meet together likewise for reading the Holy Scriptures — In these Assemblies also we exhort, reprove, and pass the Divine Censure [of Excommunication]. For the Judgments in this place are delivered with all Gravity, and Solemnity, as among Men, who are sure they stand in the Presence of God: And the Judgment here pronounced against Delinquents<sup>n</sup> is the last previous Sentence of the Judgment to come against him, who hath sinned to such a degree, as to be excluded from our Assemblies, and from the Communion of Prayers, and other Religious Commerce. The Presbyters, who preside in these Assemblies, are raised to this Dignity, not by Money, but the Testimony of their Lives, &c.*

Here it is plain, that the Christians of the Second Century looked upon the censured Sinner as precondemned by God; and that the Sentence of Excommunication, and by consequence of Absolution, was not only declarative, but judicial; *not that they assumed the Power of Damning, and Saving, as he speaks with a Face of Brass, or invaded the incommunicable Attributes of God; but that God was pleased, as under the Law, so under the Gospel, to bind or loose Sinners by the Ministry of Men; and*

<sup>s</sup> Apologet. c. 39.

<sup>n</sup> Summumque futuri Judicii præjudicium est, &c.

had he done it by the Ministry of Angels, as I observed before, had he said to those blessed Spirits, or any appointed number of them, *Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained, and whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven*: I say, had he been pleased to give this Power of the Keys to any Order, or Number of the Holy Angels, these Enemies of Priestly Power might have said the same thing. I hope in my Second Letter I have proved this Doctrine, relating to the Power of the Keys, by sufficient Authorities, particularly by the Censure of S. Ambrose upon Theodosius the Great; which as it was submitted to by the Emperor upon Christian Principles, and never condemned by any Church of that, or after Ages: So is it highly approved by ours in the second part of the Homily of the right use of the Church, where are these Words; *And according to this Example of our Saviour Christ, in the Primitive Church, which was most Holy, and Godly, and in the which due Discipline with severity was used against the Wicked; open Offenders were not suffered once to enter into the House of the Lord, nor admitted to Common-Prayer, and the use of the Holy Sacraments with other true Christians, until they had done open Penance in the whole Church. And this was practised not only upon mean Persons, but also upon Rich, Noble, and Mighty Persons; yea upon Theodosius, that Puissant, and Mighty Emperor, whom, for committing a grievous, and wilful Murder, St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, reprov'd sharply, and did also excommunicate the said Emperor, and brought him to open Penance. And they that were so justly exempted, and banished as it were from the House of the Lord, were taken, as they be indeed, for Men divided, and separate from Christ's Church, and in most dangerous Estate; yea, as*  
St. Paul

St. Paul saith, even given unto Satan, the Devil for a time, and their Company was shunned, and avoided of all Godly Men, and Women, until such time as they by Repentance, and publick Penance, were reconciled. I have set forth this Proceeding of St. Ambrose against the Emperor *Theodosius*<sup>i</sup> at large, and of his humble Behaviour during all the time he was debarred from entring into the Church, which was a lesser sort, or lower degree of Excommunication. The Religious Emperor, as well as the Holy Father, knew that the power of the Keys was committed to a particular Order of Men for maintaining, and upholding the Kingdom of God in the Kingdoms of the World, and for preserving the Authority of his Ministers therein, and that Priests, and People, standing in awe of that Spiritual Power, might be afraid to do any thing, that would dishonour their Spiritual Society, and Profession, or give Offence to the *Jews*, or to the *Gentiles*, or to the *Church of God*. The Clergy of all Churches ought to take care to preserve this Power in Purity, and Force, and not to let it fall into decay, or desuetude, or suffer by irregular Administration, lest God should not only call them to an account for their Stewardship in this World, and in Judgment take it from them, but condemn them in the next, as Male-Administrators of his Kingdom upon Earth, and Traditors of the Trust he hath committed to them. I fear the *Nonuser*, and *Abuser* of this Sacred Power in the Church of *England*, hath been a great Ingredient in the Judgments that formerly, and of late have fallen upon it, and particularly of the progressive Contempt of her Clergy, and growing Number of her Enemies. For the neglect of using this Power to the great, and holy End for which God hath appointed it, and using of

---

<sup>i</sup> In the Second Letter.



it, when it is administred, in such manner, as is not agreeable to the holy Nature, and Solemnity of such a divine Institution, I may justly say, are the *High-places* that yet remain in the Church of *England*, which ought always, and by all means, in season, and out of season, to endeavour the Restauration of the ancient Godly Discipline in its Purity, in Conjunction with her Apostolical Government, and Purity of Doctrine, and Worship: And would the Governours of the Church in Sincerity, and the Sense of their Duty, go about this good Work, which is wanting to complete our Reformation, God, I trust, would give success to their faithful Endeavours; and when it was done, he would with the pure, strict, ancient Discipline restore the Church, and her Clergy to their ancient Veneration; he would then multiply the number of her Friends, as fast as he hath suffered her Enemies to encrease; nay, then he would make her Enemies, her worst Enemies, even such as is the Author of the *Rights*, and his Accomplices, the Disciples of *SPINOZA*, to be at Peace with her, and become her good Friends.

Every one, who reads his Book, must needs observe how he sets himself with all the Sophistry he hath to argue against the Ecclesiastical Discipline, and in such a manner as becometh himself, against the Power of Excommunication, from some Corruptions in the Exercise, and Execution of it, which the Clergy bewail, as much as he ridicules, and which by consequence have been, and still are, much more the Misfortune, than the Fault of the Church. It was bewailed by \* *Edward Fox*, Bishop of *Hereford*, before

---

\* *Edw. Foxus* — Ep. *Herefordensis*, vir eloquentiæ laude præstans, prudensque etiam & gravis, ac nobiliss. Heros *Henricus* Dom. de *Staffordio*, virum hunc mire coluit, & in gratiam auctoris aliqua ejus Opera ex Latino in Anglicum vertit sermonem. Ex iis quæ scripsit

before the Reformation, in a *Treatise concerning the Division between the Spirituality, and Temporality*, of which I have seen an *English Translation* by *Henry Stafford*, Son of *Edward Duke of Buckingham*, Printed by *Robert Redman* at *London*. In this *Treatise* the *Bishop* sets forth with great Faithfulness, and Grief, the Corruptions both of the *Regulars*, and *Seculars*, which I observe for the Honour of the Clergy, who never palliated, or concealed the faults of their own Order in former, or later Ages, as may be seen in the Works of *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, *Hierom*, *Ambrose*, &c. not to mention the Councils, to which our Author hath an implacable Enmity, and many Writers even of the latter, and most corrupt Ages of the Church. It is out of the Writings of Clergymen, that he hath pick'd up his Discoveries of the Corruption of the Clergy, which I observe again in bar, and abatement to his Accusations, which he brings against the whole Order, without distinction of good from bad.

Wherefore his malicious Reflections upon the re-formable Male-Administration of Church-Censures are no Argument against them, unless it be good Logick to argue against the goodness of a thing, from the abuse of it, which may be reformed. The Foundation of his Argument against them is purely verbal, and precarious, in such Suppositions, and Expressions as this; *Their pretending to a Judicial Power; their assuming to themselves a Jurisdiction in contradistinction to the Magistrates*: So, if he pleases,

---

*Scripsit hæc pauca saltem invenies, Differentiam utriusque Status & Potestatis. Quem in Anglicum vertit ipse Staffordius. Pitt. ad An. 1530. n. 930. Hen. Staffordius, Edwardi illustriss. Ducis Buckinghamiæ filius, vir sælicis ingenii, & in melioribus quibusque disciplinis insigniter eruditus, &c. Illud unum constat eum e Latino in Anglicum sermonem eleganter versisse Edw. Foxii Præsulis Herefordensis opus de Differentia Potestatis Ecclesiastica & Secularis. Id. ad Ann. 1558.*

he may say their assuming to themselves a Power of making a Man a Member of Christ, a Child of God, and an Heir of the Kingdom of Heaven. But in this way of speaking of the Sacerdotal Power, he begs the Question, which, as I observed before, is a Question of *Fact*, *whether God hath not given his Ministers such a Power, and Jurisdiction?* and if he have, then all his Arguments *ab incommodo* upon the Civil Power, were they true, would fall to the ground. The King, or Queen is the Supreme Magistrate in this Kingdom, and in his way of arguing he may write another Book against some parts of our Constitution, and the Rights, and Grants, and Privileges of Societies, as well as single Persons; because in many cases they so limit, and restrain the Royal Power, and, as he phrases it, takes from the Sovereign the Power of protecting his Subjects: As for Example, if the College, of which he is a Member, will expel him, neither the Supreme Magistrate, nor all the Magistrates in the Kingdom can hinder them, or protect him from Expulsion. If the lower House of Parliament will send one of their Members to the *Tower*, or Impeach a Peer, though never so great a Favourite of the Sovereign, neither he, nor all the Magistrates of the Kingdom can hinder it, or protect them; and if Human Constitutions can so restrain, and tie up the Hands of the Regal Power, may not God by his Divine Constitutions do the same? Is it such a strange thing that the Church should have the Power, which every Society, every College, every Company, every University hath to turn out their Incorrigible, and Contumacious Members, or Members who commit such Crimes for which by the Charter, or Statutes they ought to be Expelled? Every Father of a Family hath power, or, as he is pleased to express it, *assumes* a Power to himself, of turning a Disobedient Son, or Servant independently of the Magistrate,

out of his House; and may not the Fathers of the Church exercise the same power which God hath given them, and expects they should exercise upon open, scandalous, or obstinate Sinners, as they will be answerable therefore to him at the Day of Judgment? The Question therefore is, Whether or no, God hath *vested* them with this Power, or whether they have *assumed* it to themselves? And the Reader is left to judge, whether he will believe *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*, the *ancient, universal, and unanimous* Testimony of the Catholick Church, or this upstart number of Novelists, who are Enemies to the Christian Faith, and Religion, as well as the Priesthood, because Priests are ordained for the defence thereof.

But he <sup>1</sup> saith, if the power of Excommunication belongs independently to the Clergy, then the Magistrate could neither Banish, Imprison, or put a Man to Death, because it would deprive him of the Communion of the Church. By Communion, he means actual Communion, or *Communicating*, as he otherwise expresses himself, and then here's a dainty Argument indeed, which proves abundantly too much, and by consequence nothing at all. For if this be a true Argument against the Sacerdotal Power of Excommunication, then a Christian must not live, and Trade in a Country, where there are no Christian Meetings for Worship, or such Christian Meetings with which he cannot join; because, as he speaks, *it would hinder him not only from Communicating with his own Church, but with all the Churches in the World*. For the same Reason a Faithful Christian must not go a long Voyage in a *Turkish* or *Indian* Ship, or a Vessel only Mann'd with *Quakers*; or in a Journey rest on the Lord's Day, where there is no Church. In these Cases, as in close Imprison-



ment, or banishment to desert Islands, the Prisoners and exil'd Persons want indeed the benefit of actual Communion, but they have the comfort of being in a state of Communion with all the Churches in the World. And as for the want of actual Communion, if their close Confinement, or Banishment is just, they are justly deprived of it, as any other Criminal in close Imprisonment is of the enjoyment of his Family; but if they be unjust, then the Church, which protects no Man from the Power of the Magistrate, teaches Submission, and *Passive-Obedience*, and leaves the unrighteous Magistrate (who is here supposed to be Supreme) to answer for his Unrighteousness to God.

His next *Herculean* Argument against the Sacerdotal Power of Excommunication, is taken from the effect of it, because excommunicate Persons are to be avoided, until they return to the Church. This he sets forth in most <sup>m</sup> Tragical manner, without saying that it extends not to near Relations, as Husbands, Wives, Children, Servants, or Subjects, nor to cases of Necessity, or cases of Conversing with Excommunicates for their Admonition, Instruction, and Edification. However, this avoiding of Excommunicates, he saith, doth not only deprive them of their Employments, and Professions; but if strictly put in Execution, would cause them to lead Lives more to be dreaded than Death it self, and at last to Perish most miserably. How false this is, appears from the Exceptions just now mentioned, in which Conversation, and Commerce with Excommunicates is not forbidden. But admitting all he saith were strictly true, I must tell him, that all this Misery would be the effect of the Excommunicates Contumacy, and Stubborness, and not of the Encommunication; because the Church is always

ready to receive him upon Repentance; this Power of her Priests being not for Destruction, but Emendation, and Edification, as we shall hereafter see. He cannot but know, that other Civil Societies, particularly the Universities, have a Power like this, which they exercise in *Excommunicating* the Citizens, and Magistrates of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, when their Rights, Privileges, and Immunities are invaded by them; but they do not this with an intention to hurt them, or their Families, but to reduce them to Reason, being always ready to take off their Prohibition of the Scholars to Trade with them, as soon as they remove the Cause; and what any of them suffers in the mean time by being Excommunicated, his Sufferings are properly from himself. I need not make any Application of this Power, to that of the Church, only I would ask our Author, first, Whether it is a *Power of Life, and Death*, as the other, <sup>a</sup> he saith, is in the Clergy; because perhaps a stubborn Townsman may bring himself to poverty for want of Trade by his own Stubbornness? And, Secondly, Whether God may not give the like Power to his Ministers of commanding the People for the Benefit, and Honour of his Church, in all places to avoid the Conversation of Excommunicates, till they are reconciled? Let us see what we can find to this purpose in the Scriptures; I say in the Scriptures, which he very seldom cites in his Book. In *Matth.* xviii. 15, 16, 17, 18. our Lord gives a Rule to his Disciples of proceeding with an injurious Brother. First he directs to tell him of his Fault privately, then to admonish him before one, or two, or more; and if he could not be brought to Reason by neither of those ways, then to tell it to the Church; but if he neglected to hear the Church,

---

<sup>a</sup> P. 39.

then they were to look upon him as an Heathen, and Publican, that is, as one no longer fit to be conversed with. Now, supposing this were only a Permission, and not a strict Command; yet what our Lord permitted, the Governors of the Church have power to enjoin; and the Author of the RIGHTS may in his way of arguing against shunning Excommunicates, say the same thing against our Lord's Directions here, that it deprives Men of their Professions, and other Mens Assistance; and if strictly put in Execution, would make them lead Lives more to be dreaded than Death, and at last perish most miserably. The same he may say of the Apostle's Command to the *Romans*, Chap. xvi. ver. 17. of marking them, who cause Divisions, and Offences, and to avoid them; and of his Injunction to the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* v. 9, 11. not to keep Company with open Fornicators, Idolaters, Drunkards, Railers, and Extortioners, with such no not to eat. So in 2 *Thess.* iii. 14. it was his Command, that if any obeyed not his Word in that Epistle, they should note that Man, and have no Company with him, that he might be ashamed. So St. *John* in his 11<sup>d</sup>. Epistle commanded the Christians to whom he wrote it, that if any came among them under the Name of Christians, and did not confess, that Christ was come in the Flesh, that they should not receive them into their Houses; nor so much as salute them. If they had power to prohibit Christians to keep company with such open scandalous Sinners, that they might be ashamed, then I hope they had power for the same good end to command them to avoid Excommunicates, and that this power is still in their Successors, to whom the power of the Keys belongs. I presume it is reasonable to think, that the *Corinthians*, who were to shun the incestuous Person before Excommunication, did avoid him afterwards, what inconvenience soever he suffered by it, while

he was refractory, and stood out. Every one who knows the Discipline of the Primitive Times, must know how strictly these Directions, and Commands of our Lord, and his Apostles were observed; and, for my own part, I think them so binding upon my Conscience, that I should think my self obliged to have no Commerce, or Conversation with the Author of the *Rights*, and some other Writers as bad as he, mentioned in *The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity*, excepting in the cases above mentioned, and to shun them in all places; and wherever I by chance met them, not to bid them *God speed*, or to sit down at a Table to a Feast where there were such Spots. But to expose, and exaggerate with all his power the Severity of this Godly Discipline, and make it as odious as he can, ° he saith, *The Magistrate is not exempt from it, since he is an Ecclesiastical Subject, but may be reduced to this miserable Condition, of being avoided, and shunned by his Soldiers, and others, on pain of being delivered to Satan.* How false this is, appears from the Exceptions before mentioned; the Duty of shunning Excommunicates not extending to natural, domestick, or civil Relations, or to discharge any Child, or Servant, or Subject, or Soldier from his Duty to his domestick, civil, or military Superior, though he were not only an Excommunicate, but an Apostate; and therefore as this Discipline doth not affect a Magistrate of any sort in his domestick, so neither in his civil, or military Capacity; but as all his Children must obey, and all his Servants attend him within Doors, so must all his Subjects obey him, all his Officers attend him, and all his Soldiers march and fight in Obedience to his Orders without. He must still have his *Lictors*, and still ride in his *Curule Chair*; and to be short, he is the same Magistrate



after, as he was before Excommunication, and must have the same Duty paid him by his Inferiors in their several Relations, and Posts. In a word, his full Charge against this Discipline is false, <sup>p</sup> for it deprives no Man of all Converse, as he saith, nor is any Man left by it alone, and solitary in the midst of Mankind.

Then he goes on <sup>a</sup> to reflect on the Censures of the Church for trifling Causes, for which the Penalty of Excommunication is commonly inflicted. Here again is his Mobish fallacious way of arguing against the use of Power from the abuse of it, which, if it were true, would argue down all Domestick, Civil, and Military Power in the World. But, I must tell him, if those he calls trifling Causes were examined, they would be found to be the weighty Causes of Contempt, and Contumacy, when refractory Persons will not own the Judgment, and Authority of the Ecclesiastical Courts, or submit to them, tho' but in so small a matter <sup>r</sup> as a Groat, or a Shilling.

In the next place, he saith, <sup>t</sup> That if Excommunication belongs by Divine Right to the Clergy, then the Magistrate hath not all Power necessary for the Protection of his Subjects, because by the Terror of this dreadful Punishment, they drive the most useful Citizens, and their Trades into Foreign Parts, to the Ruin of the Commonwealth. To which I answer, as formerly, Whether it belongs to them, or no, is a Question of Fact; and if it doth, as indeed it doth belong to them, then the Terror of the Punishment is no Argument against it. For all Punishments of all sorts are more or less terrible, and the Argument is as good against the Civil, as the Ecclesiastical Power. What a powerful Declaration could he make against *Aque, & igni interdicere*? and how finely could he harangue it against the dreadful Power of making

Acts of Attainder, or against the Powers that Kings, and Sovereign Estates have of forbidding their Subjects, under the pain of Death, to harbour, or receive Traytors, and Rebels, by which he may say, they drive the Noble Peers, the worthiest Gentlemen, the best Patriots, and the most useful Citizens, and their Trades into Foreign Parts, to the Ruin of the Commonwealth? But *Secondly*, if by the Terror of Excommunication he means the Terror of it, as a pure Spiritual Punishment, that can drive none into Foreign Parts, because an Excommunicate at Home is as much an Excommunicate Abroad all the Christian World over, being bound by the Sentence wherever he goes; tho' he should take the Wings of the Morning, and fly into the uttermost parts of the Sea, even there his Excommunication will hold him, as well as in his own Country, and he shall be bound both in Heaven, and Earth. But if by the terrible Nature of it he means, as I suppose he doth, the Civil Punishments, that attend it by the Laws of Christian Countries, then it is not the Clergy, but the Magistrates themselves who are Judges of the publick Good, that drive out the most useful Citizens, and their Trades into Foreign Parts, to the Ruin of the Commonwealth. ' Then he saith, *If the Clergy met in Council may determine for the Christian World, when they shall eat, and when not, that is, appoint Times of Fasting and Abstinence, and can forbid the use of Flesh, and excommunicate all, who disobey them, why may they not assume the same power about Drinks, and Cloaths, of rising, or going to Bed, or working, or not working, which is included in appointing Holy Days.* Here is still the same Fallacy again of arguing against lawful Power from the abuse of it in those, that have it; and his Argument is as good in the same instances against the Tempo-

ral, as the Spiritual Power. Thus the Dissenters argue against the Power of the Church, in *imposing* Ceremonies, because if the Church have Power of *Imposing*, as they call enjoining Ceremonies, it may as well impose Ten thousand, as One, or Two; but Power is always lodged somewhere, and if those, in whom it is vested, will abuse it by grievous and insolent Impositions, they must be answerable for it to their Superiors on Earth; or, if they be Supreme, to the great God in Heaven. Nay, this way of arguing will divest a Father of a Family of all his Authority, who may make himself very uneasy to his Domesticks, by tyrannical Impositions in the same Instances. But the Question, as I must still observe, is a Question of *Fact*, whether the Governours of the Church have a Power to appoint times of Abstinence, and Fasting, and of appointing Holy Days, and in some cases of giving Orders about *Cloaths*, or not. And when our Author will desire me, I think I shall be able to prove that she hath such power, particularly as to *Cloaths*, which our Author thinks the greatest of Absurdities: "The Apostle commanded the *Corinthian* Women to be veiled, or covered in Divine Service; the Church in the best and purest Ages commanded the same; and if for the same reason the Convocation should ordain it now, after his and their Examples, and according to their excellent Discipline, I think they would do what would be for their Honour, and the Good of Souls. I once saw the greatest Queen of *Europe* quit all the State, in which she came to Church, at the Church-door, and there pull her Hoods over her Face, which she put up again when she came out; and if our Clergy in Convocation should forbid Men, and Women to go to Church as they scandalously do, in the same Habits, and Dresses, as they go to Balls, and Plays, all serious

Christians, I believe, would obey their Orders with Joy; and our Churches would then look more like the Houses, and our Divine Service more like the Worship of God, and our Congregations would then appear so venerable in the Eyes of our Adversaries, that they instead of reproaching them with too much cause, would be forced to report that *God was in them, and among them of a truth.* If the Lord Chamberlain of the Court hath Power to command all the King, or Queen's Household, or those who attend there, to wear nothing but mourning Apparel upon mournful Occasions, shall it be such an intolerable Imposition in our Spiritual Governours to do the same in Times of Penitence, and Humiliation, when it would be very incongruous for Christians to appear at the publick Assemblies in rich, and splendid Apparel, and give themselves contrary Airs to penitential Sorrow, I mean the Airs of Splendor, Festivity, and Joy. But without any Proof he still begs the Question about the Power of the Clergy, saying of it in these, as well as other Instances, that They assume it. *They, saith he, who can assume such a Power to themselves, what will they not, unless sufficiently curbed, pretend to?* And he, may a mutinous Son of a Family say in like manner to his Father, *who can assume such a Power to himself, what will he not do, unless he is curbed?* If I should take up one Pin when he bids me, he may bid me take up Pins all the Day long. If he forbids us the use of Flesh one Day, he may forbid it all the Year, and turn us out of Doors for disobeying him, and then why may he not assume the same Power about Drink, and Cloaths? *\* These are intolerable Impositions on the Liberties of Mankind.*

*\* In another place he saith, That the Arguments for which the Clergy use their Spiritual Jurisdiction will*



give them the Cognisance of all Causes, and a right to excommunicate for one Sin, as well as another, and consequently of invading of Property, and Rebellion, which would make them Judges to whom Right, and Allegiance belonged, and subject all publick, and private Causes to their determination. To which I answer, This is as false, as it is invidious: For the Church hath always disclaimed, and renounced all right to hear, or try Causes of Civil Cognisance, and Property between Subjects, or rival Princes, as not belonging to her Tribunals and Authority after the Example of her Lord, and Saviour, who when one of his Disciples said unto him, *Master, speak to my Brother, that he may divide the Inheritance with me*; answered, *Who made me a judge, or divider over you*? The Church, our Saviour's Kingdom, tho' it is in the World, yet it is not of the World, and her Governours as such, have nothing to do with worldly Suits, and Trials; nor as such can they judge of right and wrong in publick or private Capacities, except in *Cases of Notoriety of Fact*, which need neither Trial, Witnesses, or Proof, and of which every Man is judge, as well as they. In these cases they may exercise their Jurisdiction, and excommunicate open Rebels, and Raptors for their Sins, till the one lay down their Arms, and the other make Restitution: And if a Bishop should so censure a Man, who at Noon-day in the sight of a Thousand People should do to this Man, as the *Sabeans*, and *Chaldeans* did to *Job*, or it may be worse, plunder his House, and carry his Wife, and Children (if he have any) away Captive, I believe he would think that Bishop did not only what he had Power, but what he ought to do, and would think himself obliged to give him Thanks. The Church hath Power to do the same after the Criminal's Trial, where the Proof was certain, and undoubted, to bring him by the Terror of her Censures to Repentance; but if despising them he will live and die obstinate, and impenitent, he will

will go bound to God's Tribunal, which is the last resort from the Censures of the Church.

He also thinks <sup>7</sup> he argues finely against the Jurisdiction, and Censures of the Clergy, as *manifestly unjust, because they subject the same Person to undergo two Trials, and to be punish'd twice for the same Crime.* To which I answer, That it is not absolutely, and manifestly unjust for a Man to be subject under the same Power, and in the same Society to have two Trials, or to be twice punish'd for the same Crime, much less under different Powers. For first, it is neither against the Laws of Nature, or the fundamental Rules of Policy, that in some cases a Man may be subject to two Criminal, as well as to two Civil Trials, if the Wisdom of Legislators think fit. Why should it be so absurd in Policy for me, who may have the Advantage of a second, or a third Trial for my Estate, in some cases not to have two for my Life, which is dearer to me, than my Estate? Or why is it more absurd in it self, that I should, after Condemnation, have a second Trial for my Life (if it were part of our Constitution) than the benefit of the Royal Pardon, when the Sovereign is convinced, that I am found guilty, and condemned by a partial Jury, or false Witnesses, or a corrupt Judge? And if it is not absurd to have two criminal Trials in some cases in the same Society, as among us for Murder at the *King*, or *Queen's Suit*, and upon *Appeal*, it cannot be absurd to be tryed, and punished twice in different Societies, especially so different as the Church, and State, and their Punishments are, and have been taken to be. A Man may be disinherited by the Father for the same Crime, for which the Magistrate will also punish him according to Law, and the University upon *Notoriety of Fact*, or otherwise upon Proof, may expel a Member, or any number of Members for the same Crimes, for which after-

wards they may be Fined, Imprisoned, Pilloried, or put to Death. I hope therefore what a Father of a Family hath power to do without absurdity, will not be an absurd power in the Father of the Church; or that there is any more Injustice in the highest Censure of the University, than in that of the Church, which in this case so much resemble one another. And then as for being *punish'd twice for the same Crime*, there's neither Absurdity, nor Injustice in that; for a Man may be condemned to stand in the Pillory, and whipt at *London*, and at *York*; and as to the Criminal, I desire to know, what is the difference betwixt being punish'd twice by virtue of One, or Two Trials, I believe our Author, were it his own Case, would not think it much.

He reasons as much after his own manner in arguing, <sup>2</sup> *That if the Magistrate may put a Bishop to Death, he may deprive him, because that includes this.* If this be true, then he may deprive a Father of his *Fatherhood*, and dissolve his *jura Sanguinis*, and absolutely, and for ever discharge his Children from their natural Duty of Obedience, because he can put him to Death; or, without excepting the Case of Adultery, absolutely discharge a Husband of his *Relation to his Wife founded by Divine Institution*, and give her in Marriage to another Man. Nay, if this fallacious, and improper way of arguing, and speaking were to be admitted, then a Pagan Magistrate, a *Nero*, *Decius*, or *Dioclesian*, may deprive a Bishop, because he may put him to Death. Nay, after this manner of arguing, when a Highway-Man kills a Bishop, he deprives him; and then Dr. *Sharp*, and Cardinal *Beton*, Archbishops of *St. Andrews*, properly speaking, were deprived by their Murderers, because, according to our Author's way of speaking, putting to Death includes Deprivation. Thus Iron

is included in the making of a Sword, but did ever any say, that because a Cutler could make a Sword, he could therefore make Iron. So Loss of Memory, or Sight is included in Death, but did ever any Body say, when he spake properly, that he, who killed a Man deprived him of his Sight or Memory? For Privation, or Deprivation suppose the Existence of the Subject, which is said to be deprived, and not the destruction of it, and therefore our Author spoke as little *Logick*, as *Law*, when he said, That the Death of a Bishop included his Deprivation, and that the Magistrate might deprive him, because he could put him to Death. *Stahlius* in his Fourth Maxim, *Quod potest majus, potest etiam minus*, would have taught him better *Logick*. And *Bronchorstius* on the *Rules of Law*, better *Law*; for when his way of arguing from the greater, included in the less, is good in *Law*, it supposes first with respect to the *Power Judicial*, that they should both be of the same Cognisance, and belong to the same Tribunal; and as to the *Legislative*, it supposes, that the less, as well as the greater, which, in his way of speaking, includes it, should be within the Sphere of their Legislation, and not exempted from it by the *Laws of Nature*, or the *Positive Laws of God*. For the Legislation of the Magistrate is limited by the *Laws of God*, and the primary *Laws of Nature* in the Soul of Man, and when his *Laws and Institutions* are contrary to them, they are void from the beginning, and therefore if the Magistrate have not Power to deprive Bishops, as many learned Men think, and as the ancient Christians believed, upon that Supposition it will not follow, that tho' the Magistrate may put a Bishop to Death, that therefore he can deprive him.

The ancient Christians, tho' they believed the Ma-

---

• Ad L. xxi. non debet, cui plus licet, quod minus est, non licere.  
gistrate



gistrate could put their Bishops to *Natural*, or *Civil* Death, yet they did not believe they had power to deprive them, and therefore when their Bishops were damned to the Quarries, and were thereby made *servi pœnae*, very *Slaves to Punishment*; they still adhered to them tho' they were the worst of Slaves, and had no Head in Law: And when St. *Chrysostom* was deprived, and banish'd by the Emperor, not only a great part of his own Flock, tho' great Sufferers for so doing, but far the greatest part of Christendom adhered to him, as if he had never been deprived. They saw not the consequence from putting to Death to Deprivation, because they believed that this belonged as much by God's Appointment to the Spiritual, or Ecclesiastical, as the other did to the Temporal Power, and that as Bishops were taken in to the Sacerdotal College, and made Fellows of it by Bishops: so none but their Collegues, who took them in, could lawfully turn them out. As for Learned Men, who are as much for the Magistrates Power, and upon much better Principles, than our Author, many such have been, and are of Opinion, that Deprivation of Bishops doth not belong to the Civil Power, I shall name but one, viz. Dr. *Du Pin*, in his *Prelæquidm* to his VII<sup>th</sup> Dissertation *De Antiqua Ecclesie disciplina*, which I have put in the *Appendix*, because it was written against the *Ropal* Usurpations over Princes, and in behalf of the *State* against the Claims and Practices of his own Church. There after a short, but clear Discourse of the difference between the Ecclesiastical, and Civil Power, he concludes, That neither Kings, nor Emperors can make, or depose Bishops, nor Bishops make, or depose them. I have said all this only to shew the inconsequence of our Author's Argument for Deprivation of Bishops, in asserting that the Magistrate may

deprive them, because he can put them to Death. What I have said also sheweth his other Fallacies in the pursuit of this Argument, as <sup>c</sup> where he saith, That to affirm, as Non-jurors do, that the *Magistrate cannot deprive a Bishop, but by taking away his Life, is to say he cannot remove some part of the Punishment, which he might justly inflict, without remitting the whole.* It is certain, Death puts an end to the relation betwixt the Bishop, and his Flock, because it destroys him, who is the Correlate to them; but it doth not follow from thence, that the Magistrate hath any Authority to deprive him, any more than to excommunicate him, or turn him out of the Church, into which he can take no body in. This supposes, that Deprivation of Bishops is a Punishment belonging to the Civil Magistrate, which is the Question; and he argues, as if a Roman of old had said, to affirm, that a President of a Province cannot banish a Man, but by banishing him out of Life, is to say he cannot exact part of the Punishment without remitting the whole: For a President of a Province, tho' he had a power of Life, and Death, he had no Power of Deportation by the Roman Constitution; and as the Subordinate Magistrate is to the Supreme, so the Supreme is to God, he can inflict no Punishments, but such as God hath given him Power to inflict. <sup>d</sup> He saith farther, That *it is not by Death only that the Magistrate can deprive a Bishop, but by perpetual Imprisonment, or Banishment, with a Prohibition to his Subjects of corresponding with him:* To which I say again, this is still supposing what he ought to prove, that perpetual Banishment, or Imprisonment, with such a Prohibition, doth dissolve the Relation between the Bishop, and his Flock. It would not dissolve the Relation between a Father, and his Children, or between a Husband, and his Wife; and he knows that those of the other Opinion

think the same of the Relation of the Bishop to his Flock. They are of Opinion, whether right, or wrong, I shall not here determine, that perpetual Banishment, or Imprisonment can no more deprive a Bishop, than perpetual Captivity; but that as long as he lives undeprived by the Spiritual Power, his relation will continue to his Flock.

And in the same loose manner that he argues against the Power of *Excommunication*, he also disputes against the Power of *Ordination*, as inconsistent with the *Magistrates Right* to protect the *Commonwealth*. And why forsooth? because then the Bishops may put not only Men of the best Abilities to serve the Commonwealth, but such great numbers into Orders, the better to carry on their common Interest (which we see actually done in Popish Countries) as may tend to the infinite Prejudice of the State. Here is the same Fallacy again of arguing against just Power from the supposed Abuse of it; and were there any Sense in it, it would be good against all Power, but that of God, and good Angels, which cannot be perverted, or abused. At this absurd rate may Men argue against the Legislative, or Supreme executive Power in all Countries, and particularly in our own. The independent Power of our Parliaments, may a Man say, to give away our Money, is inconsistent with the Rights of the People, because then they may give away all we have, and make us as poor, and Slaves as much as in other Countries. The independent Power of our Kings, and Queens, may another say, to make War is inconsistent with the Happiness of the Kingdom, because they may make War an hundred Years together, and thereby utterly waste both the Treasure, and People of the Land. The independent Power of our Kings, and Queens to make Peers, only whom, and when they please, another may say, is inconsi-

stent with our Constitution, because by refusing to make Peers for two, or three long Reigns together, they may extinguish the Peerage, as in *Denmark*, and with it one of the three Estates; or reduce the Peers to such a small number, as will not make a House. Nay this formidable way of disputing against the Power of the Clergy in behalf of the Magistrate, had it any force in it, would be as valid for the Clergy against the independent Power of the Magistrate, as it is for the Magistrate against that of the Clergy. The independent Power of our Kings, and Queens, may an *English*-man say, to nominate, and chuse Bishops, is inconsistent not only with the Well-being, but the Being of the Church, because they may nominate not only the most illiterate, and immoral Men for Bishops, but chuse whether they'll nominate any at all, and so in twenty or thirty Years destroy not only one of the Three Estates, but the true Church of God among us. Nay, at this idle rate of arguing, especially in his beloved way of speaking, a Man may say, *The Power which the Parliament assumes to it self of depriving Bishops, and Priests, is against the fundamental Rights and Liberties of the Church, because then they may deprive not only Men of the best Abilities to serve her, but such great Numbers, as may tend to her infinite Prejudice;* and how can we be certain they may not deprive all.

Such is our Author's way of Writing in Querks, and Sophisms through his whole Book, as I could make it appear had I room, and time to go through it all. In this manner he argues in several places, \* as invidiously as he can; *Against the Obligation, the Clergy say, the Magistrate hath to protect the Church, and assist them in doing their Duty, and putting their Decrees in Execution.* This he saith, makes the Magistrate their Deputy, or rather their Executio-



ner; and that this Obligation of executing their Decrees supposes they have a right to command it, and that the Magistrate, as well as the Laity, is only their Executioner, being obliged, right or wrong, to enforce their Commands. To which I answer, here is a Slander, and more than one Fallacy. First, here is couched a foul Slander upon the Clergy, as if they asserted, That the Magistrate was bound to protect them in evil, as much as in well-doing, and to assist them with the Secular Arm in wrong, as well as right, and in executing Unrighteous, as well as Righteous Decrees. Secondly, here are several Fallacies; as First, in saying this Obligation of the Magistrate to help, and assist the Governours of the Church to execute their Decrees, and Censures, gives them a power to command it, because they have a right to ask it, and to ask it when it is necessary, with Prayers, and Tears, and to ask it in God's Name, and for his sake; as one part of a Family may humbly, and earnestly ask the Protection, and Assistance of the Father, and Master, against the Insolence, and Injuries of the other, and to protect them in doing their Duty; and when this happened, would it not be a fine Speech in the Delinquents to say to him, *Sir*, these insolent Fellows only complain to you, to shew the power they think they have to command you, and to make you their Servant, and Executioner. Or to bring the Comparison a little nearer to the case of two independent Societies in one place, as of the Universities, and Cities of *Oxford*, and *Cambridge*; let us suppose, that a certain number of Scholars outraged by Townsmen, should complain of them in either place to the *Mayor*, or a certain number of Townsmen outraged by Scholars should prefer their Complaints to the Vice-Chancellor, would it be a good and reasonable Answer in either of those Magistrates to say, *Get ye gone you insolent Fellows, do you think you have a right to command*

me, and that I will be your Executioner? To conclude, this way of false Reasoning, were it true, would make the Clergy, as much the Magistrate's Deputy, and Executioner, as the Magistrate the Clergy's. As for Example, if in a Notorious, flagrant Sedition, or Rebellion, the Magistrate (for I still use his own Term) should convene the Clergy in Convocation, and desire, or require the Aid of their Censures against the *Corahs*, and *Dathans* of such a Sedition, or Rebellion, they might by his Logick, instead of assisting the Magistrate according to their Duty, return him this Answer, *What, doth he suppose he hath a right to command us? we'll be none of his Deputies, or Executioners.* The Vanity of this Argument might also be shewn by application of it to two independent Kingdoms, or States, the Sovereigns of which are bound by the Laws of Nations upon notification not to protect, or assist one another's Rebels, but to drive them out of their Dominions, or deliver them up, that is, in his scurrilous Expression, to be one another's Executioners; but, I hope, I have said enough to detect the Folly, and Malice of this way of Reasoning, in which our Author delights so much. For he uses the <sup>e</sup> same Argument against the Clergy, to prove that if their Power were Judicial, they might save, or damn, as they think fit, and that God is bound to execute their Sentences, though they condemn a good, and absolve an ill Man; because a Sentence pronounced by a competent Authority is valid, tho' it is not right; and consequently on this Supposition Men ought to pay Divine Worship to these Judges, rather than to God himself, since the Power of Saving, and Damning is in them, and God himself is no more than their Executioner.

According to this silly way of reasoning he may say, First, That all Criminal Judges may save, or damn,

as they think fit, though in all Countries they are sworn to the best of their Understandings to administer true Judgment. *Secondly*, That though they condemn an innocent, and acquit a guilty Man, be it by pure Error or Corruption, the Sovereign is bound to execute their Sentences, that is, to let them be executed, be they right, or wrong. *Thirdly*, That it is no matter how the People live, could they be acquitted by these Judges, to whom Men ought to pay more Honour, than to the Sovereign himself, since the power of Condemning, and Saving is in them, and the Sovereign is no more than their Executioner. As many Falsties, and Fallacies, as there are in this case, so many there are in what he hath said against the *Judicial* Power of Church Governors, who judge for, and under God in Spirituals, as the Twelve Judges of this Kingdom judge in Temporals for, and under our Kings, and Queens, who are bound in Conscience, and I think by Oath to shew Mercy, in the Cases of corrupt Verdicts, and erroneous Judgments; and so when the same case happens in Ecclesiastical Censures, the great, and righteous Judge will of his infinite Mercy do, <sup>h</sup> as the Catholick Church hath always taught.

The

---

<sup>h</sup> Cyprian. in Epist. ad Antonianum. *Neque enim præjudicamus domino judicaturæ, quo minus si pœnitentiam plenam, & justam peccatoris invenerit, tunc ratum faciat, quod a nobis fuerit hic statutum. Si vero nos aliquis pœnitentiæ simulatione deluserit; Deus qui non deridetur, & qui Cor hominis intruetur, de his quæ nos minus perspeximus, judicet, & servorum sententiam, emendet — Et quia nec Exomologesis illuc fieri potest; qui ex toto corde pœnituerint, & roga-verint, in Ecclesiam interim debent suscipi, & in ipsa domino reservari, qui ad Ecclesiam venturus de illis utique, quos in ea intus invenerit, judicabit.* So in the Epistle of the African Bishops to Cornelius, p. 118. *Si autem (quod Dominus avertat) a fratribus nostris aliquis lapsorum fefellerit, ut pacem subdole petat seipsum fallit, & decipit, qui aliud corde occultat, & aliud voce pronunciat. Nos in quantum*

The Folly, and Blasphemy of his *Horeb Contract* hath been clearly, and convincingly set forth in the *REHEARSAL*, and that being one of the Pillars of his Work, the Superstructure of his Book is utterly ruined with it, and therefore I shall take no farther notice of it. In his Introduction, which is as it were the *Ground Work* of the whole Book, he supposes there was an *antecedent State of Nature*; in which Men lived before Political Government was erected, though this wild Notion hath been so many times unanswerably confuted by the Writers against *Hobbs*, and of late by the *REHEARSAL* against Mr. *Lock*. There also he hath confounded the *Laws*, and *Rights* of Nature, miscalling the latter by the Name of the former, though this Sophism, which affects the whole Discourse, hath been long since excellently solv'd by the Bishop of *Sarum*, in his *Vindication, of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland*, where his Lordship distinguishes like a Learned *Casnist*, and *Civilian* between them; and there in a few Pages cited in the Margin, our Author may see his whole Scheme, and all he hath erected upon it, overturned.

What he hath<sup>b</sup> said against annexing Preferments to Religion, or settling Revenues upon the Clergy, or as he hath a Talent for invidious Expressions, of racking the Priests Preferments to such Opinions, is a downright Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom, who annexed such large Profits, and Revenues in Cities, Lands, Tithes, Offerings, and other Privileges upon the Jewish Priesthood; of which<sup>c</sup> *Philo* the Jew makes this Observation: *That as to Revenues,*

---

*vobis & videre, & judicare conceditur, faciem singulorum videmus: Cor scrutari, & mentem perspicere non possumus. De his judicat oculorum scrutator, & cognitor cito venturus, & de arcanis cordis, atque abditis judicaturus.*

<sup>a</sup> P. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

<sup>b</sup> P. 17, 22, 23, 25.

<sup>c</sup> De Sacerdotum Premiis, & Honoribus.



the Law made the Priests equal in Honour, and Veneration to Kings, which commanded the People to bring their Tributes to them from all Quarters, but in a different manner, saith he, from that in which People pay Tribute to Kings, which they pay with Compulsion, and Complaints, hating the Gatherers of their Taxes, as publick Pests, and finding Pretences not to pay them at the appointed times. But they never failed to pay the Priests Dues, with such Willingness and Joy, without being asked, as if they rather were the Receivers, than Givers; Men, and Women at the set anniversary times bringing their Tithes and Offerings with such good Presages, Gratulations, and Alacrity, as cannot be expressed.

I wish he were as fit and worthy to read this Tract, as it is worthy to be read by him, and others; but no Reading, no Authority will make Impressions upon Men, who envy Priests their Revenues, and write against them, because they would share in the sacrilegious Spoil of them, and who have the Spite of Infernal Spirits against the Christian Priesthood, and Church. <sup>m</sup> He saith, hereafter he will fully prove, that in the first Ages they subsisted by the Alms of the People, and were in all other matters wholly dependent on them in their choice, as well as their Alms. This and many other things we are to expect against the Clergy from this formidable Hereafter-Book. Well, che venga, let it come; I hope the Clergy are prepared for it; it will be *orientis bestia ultimus Morsus*, the last Hiss, I trust, of the old Serpent, and then he will have done his worst. The Christians of old were but *One Society*, *One Sect*, which had *One Faith*, *One Baptism* for the Remission of Sins; *One Lord Jesus* through whom they worshipped the *One God*; *One visible Head*, or Principle of Unity in every Church, under the in-

visible Bishop of their Souls, and High-Priest of their Profession, the same Lord *Jesus*; *One Catholick Communion* in all places of the Earth; *One Priesthood*, and *One Representative Sacrifice* of Memorial, the Bond of Unity and Peace in that one Communion. This, I hope, I have shewed in the following Letters; but these Mens new Scheme of Religion, if we may believe their Speaker in his <sup>n</sup> Book of the *Rights*, is destructive of Christianity, as one Society, and one Sect: For all the Principles of Religion, that they are pleas'd to own is only the <sup>o</sup> *Being of a God*, and *his Providence*, which he saith whosoever denies, *may not only be justly punished by the Magistrate, but also by every one in the State of Nature*, upon supposition of which Imaginary State nothing can be more absurd. But then as to the Worship of God he <sup>p</sup> saith, *All Men are free to worship him according to their Consciences, and after the manner they think most agreeable to his Will, and to profess such speculative matters, as they think true; that do another Man no Injury, because in these matters, Men are still in a State of Nature, subject to God and their own Consciences, without any Sovereign to determine what they shall believe or profess, and that the Magistrate is bound to protect Men in the way they choose of worshipping God, as in other indifferent matters.* So that Men; but why do I say Men; for Christians, if they like it, are now free to worship God after the Patriarchal, Jewish, or Mahometan manner, or any other way which may be devised of worshipping of him, without Christ as well as with him, altogether as well in a Synagogue, or Mosque, as in a Christian Church; nay, they may if they please, worship God, and particularly administer the Eucharist after the impure Gnostical manner, which I am asham'd to mention, according to his wild Scheme, which is

---

<sup>p</sup> P. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

<sup>p</sup> P. 12.

<sup>p</sup> P. 14, 15.

erected on many Absurdities and Presumptions, as that <sup>9</sup> *The Magistrate hath no Power about indifferent things; that Men may form themselves into what Companies, Clubs, and Meetings they please, which the Magistrate (he means the Supreme Magistrate) as long as the Publick sustains no Damage, cannot hinder without manifest Injustice, and acting contrary to the end for which he is intrusted.* Where he supposes what he should prove, that the People, and not the Magistrate, is Judge of Publick Good, and Hurt, and that he is their *Trustee*. It also involves a manifest Contradiction; because, if Men, as to speculative Matters of Belief, are still in a State of natural Freedom to believe and follow the Dictates of their own Consciences, then the *Atheist*, who cannot believe the Being and Providence of God, ought to be free as to his Conscience: For <sup>r</sup> whether there is a God, and whether or no he minds Human Affairs, is a *speculative Point*, and by consequence, he that after *impartial Examination* cannot believe there is a God and Providence, but thinks that Belief false and superstitious, and that it is hurtful to Mankind to possess them with such slavish Fears, ought to have his natural Freedom, and not to be punished and persecuted for his Belief. For were *Epicurus, Democritus, Diagoras, Protagoras, Lucretius, Lucian* or *Varinus* alive, they would retort upon our Author, and tell him he was a *Creed-maker*, and that it was precarious to say, that not believing an *Invisible Power, and his concerning himself with Human Affairs, was injurious to Humane Society*; that on the contrary it was injurious to Men to have the Belief of such a superstitious Opinion impos'd upon them, because it made them their own Slaves, and tormented their Minds day and night with needless Terrors; and that whom the *Rods, and Axes, and Jails, and De-*

CCXXIV      *A Prefatory Discourse*

portation, and *Servitude*, would not terrify from violating their Duties to the Publick, neither, as Experience shew'd, wou'd the Fear of an Invisible Power restrain. They wou'd tell him in his own Language, that the Magistrate's Power could not reach their Consciences, nor could they invest him with such a Power, against the Dictates of their own Understandings, which they had a natural Right to follow, and that he who wou'd teach Men such *slavish* Doctrines, much more he that wou'd impose the Belief of them upon them, was ' *as great an Enemy to the whole Race of Mankind*, as he that sent them to the Gallies, because the Slavery of the Mind was much greater, and more ignoble, and unworthy the Nature of Man, who is a *free thinker*, than that of the Body, and " *that they cou'd not authorize the Sovereign to extend his Power so far*.

He cannot but know that there are great Numbers of Unbelievers among us, who can argue in this manner against him, better than I can for them, and who will tell him the *Creed* he wou'd impose on them and all Mankind, is larger than he represents it to be; for he that truly believes the *Being of a God*, must believe that he is absolute in Perfection, and the first Cause of all other Beings; and he who believes that *God concerns himself in the Affairs of Mankind*, must also believe that he is to be worshipped, and that he will judge all Men after Death, because he lets wicked Men oppress, and prosper, and good Men be oppressed, and persecuted in this Life, and then impartially reward and punish them according to their Works. Here then follows the *Creed*, which he wou'd have all Men own, or be punished by every Man in a State of Nature, and by the Magistrate in every Government, as an Enemy to the whole Race of Mankind: *I believe in One God, the first*



Cause of all things, who is Infinite in Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and Presence; who is to be worshipped by Men, whose Providential Care extends it self to all Mankind; and I believe that there is another Life after this, in which he will bring all Men to Judgment, and without respect of Persons, reward the Good, and punish the Wicked according to their Works. He wou'd impose this Creed upon Men of as bright Understandings, and of as free and large thoughts as himself, under most severe Penalties, and, in his own Language, make not only the Magistrate, but the People of every Government, to be his Deputies, and Executioners: And the Reasons which he gives (let me use his own Words) for persecuting Unbelievers, are such, as they will tell him are precarious, and need proof, and such as may be retorted upon himself. First they will tell him it is precarious to say, that denying the Being of a God, or his Providence, is an Injury to Civil Societies, because Believers of both do as much Mischief to human Societies, as those who believe neither; and that Tyburn for instance, as one of them has observed, keeps the World among us in better order, than the Fear of an Invisible Power, by which Priests of all Religions have alike enslaved Mankind. They will ask him a thousand *cramp Questions*, to refute this pretended Reason: As for example, they will ask him if there is one Atheist among a thousand, or ten thousand Drunkards, or Swearers, or Fornicators, or Thieves, or Murderers? They will ask him whether at publick Executions Criminals do not always profess, or shew some Religion? and whether in all Rebellions the Rebels do not pretend most to Religion of all other Men? and whether Reformation of Religion, or the Preservation of it, hath not a thousand times been the Pretence of taking up Arms, and of murdering and deposing Princes? and whether there are not as many Robberies, and Rapes, and Treasons, and Mur-

Murders, and Cheats, even in Christian Countries, who pretend most to Religion, as in the most ignorant and barbarous, who have least. They wou'd ask him, if *Epicurus* did not live as well as *Socrates*? and if *they* did not live full as well as himself, who presum'd to make a *Creed* for them? and withal wou'd tell him, that if they could see with his Eyes, and understand with his Understanding, and believe as he pretends to believe, *the Being of a God and Providence*, they would live up to the height of those Principles; in much better Lives than they see him, or most pretended Believers do. They would also tell him, *that no Man is or can be under an indispensable Obligation to worship God*, but he that believes there is One; and that they, no more than other Men, <sup>w</sup> *can make over their Right of judging for themselves*, or ought to have their Understandings at another Man's disposal; and that there is no more reason to persecute them for not being *Deists*, than *Deists* for not being *Christians*, or *Christians* of one Church or Communion for not being of another. If Mens Understandings (would they tell him) ought to be free in one Sect, they ought to be free in all: If others must follow their own Dictates, why not we? If he who believes the Being of a God, and his Providence, must have liberty to worship him after the manner he thinks most agreeable to him, why must not we, who cannot believe one or both those Articles, have the liberty not to worship at all? Why must we, of all Men, be made Hypocrites? Indulgence is Indulgence (will they say) and Toleration is Toleration, and Liberty is Liberty, and Creeds are Creeds, and Persecution is Persecution alike among all Sorts, and Sects of Men; and therefore, according to the Proverb, let the Magistrate, who should be impartial, *save all or hang all*, loose

all or bind all. We desire the common Freedom of judging for our selves ; and we do not find, but that we have as good Understandings, and can reason as well as other Men: We are as good Physicians, as good Lawyers, as good Politicians, as good Naturalists and Mathematicians as others, be they Deists, Jews, or Christians ; and why we should not be as good Philosophers, and as good Judges in the Dispute about Religion, whether there ought to be Any or None, we declare, we cannot understand.

\* He hath promised the World, and thereby threatened the Clergy, *to treat of the Method the first Christian Emperors shou'd have taken to prevent Ecclesiastical Tyranny and Priestcraft ; of which I say again, che venga, let it come.* I suppose the Arian Emperor Constantius, Son of Constantine the Great, will be set forth by him as a great Example how his Father shou'd have treated the Clergy to prevent Priestcraft. For he, like a wise Prince, <sup>†</sup> sent out Summons to the Catholick Bishops of the Empire to appear at his Palace before him, and when they came, he commanded them to subscribe to his Banishment of *Arbanasius*, and to communicate with the *Arians*.

‡ But the Western Bishops wondering at his Enterprize, as a new thing, told him that was not a Proceeding according to Ecclesiastical Canons. To which he presently replied, *ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι*, but what I command, that shall be a Canon, and do you obey me, as the pretended Bishops of Syria have done, or I will send you into Banishment. At which the Bishops still wondering more, and lifting up their Hands to Heaven, spoke with great boldness unto him, telling him, that the Empire he had got, was not from himself, but from God.

\* P. 27.

† Athanas. in Epist. ad solitariam vitam agentes. Edit. Paris. 1627. p. 829, 830, 831.

‡ Paulinus of Treves, Lucifer of Caralis, Eusebius of Vercelli, Dionysius of Milan.

# cxxviii     *A Prefatory Discourse*

who gave it to him, and that it was to be feared, he would suddenly take it away from him, and threatened him with the Day of Judgment, persuading him, that he should not destroy the way of proceeding in Ecclesiastical Matters, neither confound the Jurisdiction of the Roman Empire, with the Authority of the Church. But he would not hear them, or suffer them to speak any more; but threatening them, he drew his Sword at them, and commanded some of them to be carried into Banishment, who afterwards like Pharaoh he revoked his Sentence. I hope he will also tell us what Moses should have done to prevent Ecclesiastical Tyranny, and Priestcraft among the Jews, and what Method Christ, and his Apostles should at first have taken to prevent it among Christians; and it will be Temper and Moderation in him, if he don't reproach them all for dividing the Priesthood from the Magistracy, and tearing the Ecclesiastical from the Civil Power, which at first were united in the Patriarchal Churches, for many Ages before, and after the Flood.

This Distinction between the Empire, and the Church, and betwixt the Imperial, and Ecclesiastical Authority, which the Bishops, as Confessors, asserted to the threatening Emperor's Face, was own'd by his Father Constantine the Great, and after him by Theodosius the Great, Valentinian, Marcian, and Justinian the Great, as I have shew'd in the second Letter; and as the Distinction of Clergy, and Laity is as old as the time of the Apostles, so this between the two Powers is as old as the Union of the Church, and Empire, and was ever admitted, and received over all Christendom (even by Henry VIII. himself) for more than Fifteen hundred Years. What was the Sense Basilus the Emperor had of these two Authorities, to the latter end of the ix<sup>th</sup> Century; may be seen from these



these Words, *It in no wise belongs to a Layman to meddle with Ecclesiastical Causes, nor to resist the whole Church, and an Œcumenial Council; for the Cognisance, and Discussion of such Matters belongs to Patriarchs, Bishops, and Priests, to whom God hath given the Power of loosing, and binding. For a Layman, tho' never so venerable and wise, is but a Layman, a Sheep, and not the Shepherd; and a Bishop, tho' never so unworthy of Reverence, is still the Shepherd, and retains the Authority of a Bishop, and the Sheep ought not to rise against the Shepherd.*

This Distinction of the Ecclesiastical, and Imperial Authority, and of the Societies to which they belonged; and the Independency of One upon the Other was plain to all Christians in former Ages, and may be so still to any that will, without Prejudice and Partiality, consider a few things. As *First*, The Difference of their Originals; the Ecclesiastical Authority having been given by God to Christ, and by Christ immediately to his Apostles, as is evident from *Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.* and from the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*, who by virtue of their Commission, did all things contrary not only to the Commands of their own Magistrates in *Hierusalem*, but to the Decrees of *Cesar* all over the Empire; for which they were called pestilent Fellows, and Movers of Sedition; and without a Divine Commission to act as they did, they had been indeed the most pestilent, and seditious Fellows that ever were in the World. *Go ye therefore* (said our Lord) *and teach all Nations, and take heed to your selves* (saith St. Paul to the Elders assembled at *Miletus*) *and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his Blood.* Here is a Spiritual Power set up in the Apostles against the Civil Powers of the

---

\* *Beveregii Συνόδιον*, Tom. II. p. 109, 110.

*Jewish*, and *Gentile* World ; a Power in the Name of King JESUS, to preach down the *Jewish*, and *Gentile* Religions, to form their Profelytes into Churches, to make Laws for the Regulation, and Preservation of them, and to turn the World upside down. Two such independent supreme Powers there were then in the World <sup>a</sup>, *clashing* and *interfering* with one another, by the fault of the Secular Power, for Three hundred Years together, even after the Credentials of Miracles ceased, one commanding to preach up Jesus, another commanding not to preach about him, and though <sup>c</sup> *God is the God of Order, and not of Confusion*, he made the Christians subject to these two *clashing* Powers, who commanded them not only different, but contrary things at the same time.

The same Persons, as for instance, the many Thousands that made up the Church in *Jerusalem*, had two such Heads, the one Spiritual, and the other Temporal ; and if these two Heads make a <sup>e</sup> *Monster*, as he blasphemously speaks, it was a Monster of God's making, for the Power which he gave to Christ, Christ gave to the Apostles, and they also gave to others, to profelyte the Subjects of all Civil Sovereigns, and form them into Societies, whether they would or no. It was then they kept <sup>g</sup> a *weekly Holy-day*, I mean the first Day of the Week, when they were forbidden by the Magistrate. It was then they exercised their spiritual Functions in this, and that Place, when the Civil Power commanded them from thence ; It was then the <sup>h</sup> Clergy put Men in such Posts in the Church, as made it necessary for their spiritual Subjects to converse with them, tho' the Magistrate forbade them to have Correspondence with such Persons. The same was afterwards done in the Reigns

<sup>c</sup> P. 33.<sup>e</sup> P. 35, 36.<sup>d</sup> P. 35.<sup>h</sup> P. 34.<sup>e</sup> Ibid.<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

of Apostate and Heretical Emperors, and the wisest Heads among the Christians then never complained, that these two independent Powers were *monstrous*, or *absurd*, as he asserts again, and again, to the great Dishonour of God. This pretended Absurdity he endeavours to make out by mere Fallacies, to deceive unwary Readers, as where he says, <sup>i</sup> *that the same Man can no more be under different Obligations, than at different Places*, which is true; but then those, who are subject to two Independent Powers, commanding contrary things, can be but under *one* Obligation, as the Apostles said unto their own Magistrates at Jerusalem, *We ought to obey God rather than Men, and whether it be right in the Sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto him, judge ye.* Such another fallacious way of speaking is that, where he saith, that <sup>\*</sup> *there cannot be two Independent Powers in the same Society*; this is his beloved Phrase, which signifies nothing; for it begs the Question by supposing the Church, and Empire to be one, and the same Society, which were always held to be different, and independent, one of another; and therefore tho' there cannot be two independent Powers in the same Society; yet in two such different Societies there may be two Independent Powers, and the same Persons may be Subjects to both. So the same Number of Men may be Freemen of the Cities of London, and York, and these two Cities may sometimes clash, and interfere with one another; but when that happens, they can be but under one Obligation, and that is, to side with the City they know, or believe is in the right. But tho' the same Men may put themselves under two independent Powers; yet, by his way of reasoning, it is absurd to say, that God can make them so subject. He hath the Confidence to say, <sup>1</sup> *it is a Doctrine as absurd,*

<sup>i</sup> P. 33.

<sup>\*</sup> P. 20, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, &c.

<sup>1</sup> P. 36.

and impossible on Earth, as Multiplicity of Gods is in Heaven : and that it is a Notion, which instead of being founded in Christianity, savours most grossly of Heathenish Divinity. O Tempora ! O Mores !

But secondly, This ancient Distinction of the Ecclesiastical, and Imperial Power, or of the Church from the Empire, is evident not only from the difference of their several *Originals*, but from their different *Extents*, the different *Ways* by which Men are admitted into them, and their different *Rights*, and *Privileges*, which for brevity's sake I shall consider altogether. For the Church is *One Society*, *One Body* all the World over, under one Priesthood, and one Head *Jesus Christ* ; from whence it comes to pass, that he, who is rightly admitted into any one Church is admitted into all, and he who is rightly turned out of one Church is turned out of all, and he that hath a Right to Communion in one Church hath a Right of Communion in all. Which is not so in Empires, Kingdoms, or Sovereign States, which make not one, but many different, and independent Societies, among which, whosoever becomes a Subject of one, doth not thereby become a Subject of the others, nor can he, who can challenge the Freedom, and Liberties of one of them, thereby challenge the Freedom, and Liberties of all the rest. Natural Birth, or *Civitatis donatio*, which we call *Naturalization*, makes a Member and Subject of the one, but Spiritual Birth, or Baptism, makes a Member, and Subject of the other ; and as baptizing a Foreigner in the Church of *England* doth not make him a Citizen of the *English* Nation ; so neither doth his Naturalization, as such, make him a Member of the Church of *England*, because he may be an *Infidel*, *Heretick*, or excommunicate Person, or a Schismatick from the Catholick Church. These few Suggestions shew, that the Church and State are different Societies, and independent of one another, and subslst by different



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* cxxxiii

ferent Powers, as they always do in Ruptures of one from the other, however they happen ; as when the Church abusing her Power, and going beyond the Limits of it, forces the State to defend it self against her by force ; or on the other hand, when the State at any time happens to persecute the Church. I might also shew the difference between these two Powers, and Societies, and the Independency of one of them upon the other, from the diversity of their *Ends*, and *Objects* ; and the differing *Means*, by which they obtain those different Ends. But for that I refer my Reader to the forecited *Proœmium* of *Du Pin* ; and when he hath read it he will not wonder that all Antiquity formerly admitted this distinction, as a Principle fundamental to the Church ; and that the Emperor *Valentinian I.* upon the Vacancy of the See of *Milan*, sending for the Bishops of the Province, spoke thus to them, <sup>m</sup> *You know very well from the Scriptures what kind of Man he ought to be, who is worthy of the High Priesthood ; that he should be a Person, who ought to instruct his Subjects not only by his Words, but by his Works, setting forth himself as a Pattern of all Vertue, and his Conversation as a Testimony and Proof of his Doctrine. Wherefore now do you place such an one in the Bishop's Chair, that we who administer the Empire, may with all Sincerity bow down our Heads to him, and receive his Reprehensions, as spiritual Medicines ; for we being but Men, must of necessity sometimes do amiss.* This he said upon Principle before the Election, in which *St. Ambrose* the Governour of the Place was chosen ; and when he was consecrated, the most excellent Emperor, as the <sup>n</sup> *Historian* calls him, being present at the Consecration, praised our Lord and Saviour in these words ; *Thanks be given to Thee our Almighty Lord, and Saviour, who hath committed the Government of*

---

<sup>m</sup> Theodor. Eccl. Hist. Lib. iv. cap. vi.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid. cap. vii.

# cxixiv    *A Prefatory Discourse*

Souls to him, to whom I had committed the Government of Bodies, by which thou hast declared that my Opinion of him was just. This was that St. Ambrose, who in his Tract of the <sup>o</sup> Dignity of the Priesthood shews the Practice of Christian Princes in these Words: Thou mayest see the Necks of Kings, and Princes bowed down to the Knees of Bishops, and kissing their Right Hands, as thinking themselves guarded with their Prayers. It was then upon Principle so much the practice of Emperors to kiss the Hands of Bishops, that the Tyrant *Maximus*, who set up for the Empire, rose up in the Counsel-chamber at *Triers* to <sup>p</sup> kiss the Hand of the same St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in his second Ambassage to him from the young Emperour *Valentinian II.* but Ambrose refused him that respect. Princes then thought themselves, like other Men, subject to the Sacerdotal Power, of which they had the same Notion after the Union of the Church with the Empire, as those Christians had, who lived before it: And I doubt not but <sup>o</sup> *Terrullian's* Rule is good in defence of it, and the Church, against our Author, *Quod apud multos unum invenitur, non erratum est, sed traditum*; as likewise that of *Vincantius Lirinensis*, *Quod ab omnibus creditum, hoc vere Catholicum*. That must be truly Catholick, which all Christians believed to be true.

His Rage against the Church hath transported him so far, that in contradiction to his own Principles he hath argued down all Civil Governments, but such where there is but one, independent, supream, despotick Head, or Power. 'If, saith he, you allow more than one Power in every Society, there's no reason to stop at two. And, if it be contrary to the nature of things that there should be more than one Power in a Family, every one sees, that the same invincible

<sup>o</sup> Cap. ii.  
Tom. 5.

<sup>p</sup> Ambros. Epist. 56. ad Valent. Imp.  
<sup>o</sup> De Praescript. c. 21.

<sup>o</sup> P. 36.

Reason

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* cxxxv

*Reason forbids more than one in a Society made up of several Families ——— What hath been said proves that all supreme, or independent Power must be indivisible. This considered with the purpose for which he said it, to shew the Inconsistency of two clashing Powers, will make it necessary to have but one absolute Master in a College without a Meeting of Fellows to clash with him; one absolute Mayor in a City without a Court of Aldermen, or Common Council to clash with him, and one despotick absolute King in every Kingdom without any Parliament or Parliamentary Power to clash, and interfere with him, and his one, independent, and indivisible Power. Thus to prevent the Absurdity of clashing, and interfering Powers, we must not only abolish the Ecclesiastical Power, but reform most of the Civil Constitutions of the World; and particularly we of this Nation, ought to have no Parliaments, or no Kings, because they clash so often together, nor two independent Houses of Parliament, because they frequently quarrel, and clash together, and sometimes encroach upon one another's Rights. To be short, his Argument taken from the clashing of Powers, as an Argument, is of as much force for the Church against the State, as for the State against the Church: For if the Ecclesiastical Power must be abolished, because it is independent on the Civil, and when it is abused interferes with it; for the same reason may a Courtier of Rome, a Bellarmine, or Baronius say, the Civil Power must be taken away, because it is independent on the Ecclesiastical, and when abused clashes, and interferes with it, though it is of immediate Divine Institution, and originally founded in the Person, and Office of our Lord, and Saviour Jesus Christ. By this way of arguing, as I hinted before, Man, whom God, tho' the God of Order, hath made subject to two internal clashing Powers, must entirely give up himself*

cxxxvi *A Prefatory Discourse*

to one of the two, and when it comes to that, I do not doubt much to which of the two our Author will surrender himself. The *four new Societies* formed of late in a neighbouring Nation, when it comes to the choice of which of the two clashing Principles shall have the sole, supreme Government of Man, shew which shall have the most Votes among some sorts of Men.

I must also observe, that by the very Scheme he hath made to argue against the *Independency* of the Ecclesiastical Power, he hath set up many independent, unaccountable Powers in Religion, as absurd, and inconsistent with the Power of the Magistrate, as he pretends the Power of the Church to be. For his own Scheme excludes the Magistrate from all Power in Religion, and Religious Matters; Men having a natural Right to *believe, and profess such speculative Matters which they think true, and to worship God after the manner they think most agreeable to his Will; and that in all matters of Religion, with respect to which they are always in a State of Nature, they must determine for themselves, and follow the Dictates of their own Consciences, and also have a natural Right to form themselves into Companies, Meetings, and Churches for Religious Worship after their own way; and to agree on some Places, and on the Persons to officiate, and to judge of the Forms, and Modes of Worship, and of the Rites, and Ceremonies they will observe; in doing of all which the Magistrate, who as to these things* <sup>u</sup> *hath no more Power over the Peasant, than he hath over him, is* <sup>w</sup> *bound to protect them; or if he, do not,* <sup>x</sup> *it will force them to defend those natural Rights by Arms, of which no Human Power can deprive them.*

Here he doth not only give to all Religious Societies the same independent Power, which the Church

<sup>u</sup> P. 14, 15, 23.

<sup>w</sup> P. 24, 25.

<sup>x</sup> P. 24.

<sup>w</sup> P. 16, 24, 25.

<sup>x</sup> P. 17, 29.



claims to it self; but in such a manner, in which all true Churches have always abhorred to claim it, *viz.* that if the Magistrate will not protect them in the Choice and Profession of their Religion, they may, and, I think he means, ought to defend it by force of Arms. Here is *Resistance* added to the independent Power of I know not how many pretended Churches, which the Church he writes against, and all true Churches ever disclaimed. The Magistrate *hath no power to persecute them*; but if he according to his bounden Duty will not protect them, they may against their natural, and sworn Allegiance, persecute him by taking up Arms against him, and in defence of their Belief, and way of Worship, turn the Nation into a Theater of Confusion, and a Field of Blood.

Let us suppose then, that there were the same Heretical Sect of *DOCETES* among us, that was among the Primitive Christians in the Time of the *7* Apostles, who deny'd the Humanity of Christ, believing, and professing that he had not a *real* Body, but only in *appearance*, nor was *really* born, nor *really* crucified, nor *really* rose from the Dead, but only in *appearance*; and as they were *Gnostics*, so also chose that impure manner of Eucharistical Worship, which I intimated before, as most agreeable in their corrupt Sentiments to the Will of God: Let us, *I say*, suppose this Sect grown to great Numbers, and Strength among us, as it might be double, or treble to that of any other Sect, and that *Her Majesty* had declared she could not in Conscience see her People any longer perverted by such an impure Sect, and so destructive of the Christian Faith, and thereupon had passed an Act of Parliament against all farther Toleration of them: Upon such a Supposition our Author by his Principles, if he were

# ccxxviii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

one of them, must like the *Man of Belial*, *SHEBA* the Son of *Bichri*, presently blow the Trumpet, and cry out, *To your Tents, to your natural Rights, O Israel*; *As to the Choice and Profession of our Religion, we are still in a State of Nature, the Magistrates as to that, hath no more Power over us than we have over them; we never gave, or could give them a Power to deprive us of this natural Liberty; they cannot hinder us from meeting without manifest Injustice; and therefore since they act contrary to the main End, for which we intrusted them with Power, and have exceeded their bounds in abridging our Liberty in which they should protect us, the Laws of Nature not only permit, but oblige us to have recourse to Arms*: You see how we are persecuted contrary to those Laws, and to the Honour of God, and the good of Mankind: *To your Tents therefore with all speed to defend your natural Freedom; only be strong, and of a good Courage; we'll do unto them as unto Sisera, and Jabin, and make them like Zeba, and Salmanna.*

It will be hard for him to name any one Right, Liberty or Privilege, which the Church, or if he pleases *High Church*, claims independently on the Magistrate by *Divine Right*, which he doth not demand in a manner, as independent of him, by *Natural Right*, for every Society that pretends to be a Church. Is it the liberty of professing what they think is the true Faith? So doth he for every Sect. Is it the liberty to worship God in the manner they think most fit? So doth he for every Sect. Is it the liberty to gather, and form Churches in all Places for Worship? So doth he for all Men of the same Faith, true or false, which he calls *Belief* in *Speculative matters*. Is it the Power of *Legislation*, for which he is so incensed against the Church, for presuming to make *Canons*, or Laws for the Govern-

ment, Regulation, and well-being of her own Body? This he also challenges for every other pretended Church. For if Men have a *natural Right* to form themselves into Societies for Profession of Belief and Divine Worship, they must also have a Right to make Laws and Orders for the Government, and Preservation of those Societies, without which they can neither be formed, or subsist. Is it the Power of *Jurisdiction*, for which he hath written such bitter Investives against the Church for presuming to censure her disorderly Members, and in particular for *assuming a Power* to her self of turning the Contumacious, and Incurrible out of her Communion, and obliging those who are in it to shun them, and avoid all Conversation with them? Even this Power also he gives to every Sect over its own Members. For if Men have a natural Right to form Societies, and make Laws for the Government, and Well-being of them, they must also have a Right to punish, because the Power of making Laws, and Orders, signifies nothing without a Power, to punish the Transgressours of them; and therefore we find that all Religious Fraternities among us take upon them, in a way of proceeding independent on the Magistrate, to censure their own disorderly Members, and not only to turn them out of their Communion, when they are incurrible, but <sup>a</sup> to oblige every one of their Society to be the Executioners of their Sentence, by enjoining them to shun, and avoid them, whatsoever they suffer by it; tho' according to his way of reasoning <sup>b</sup>, it takes from the Magistrate the Right of depriving Men of their Trades and Professions, and causes the excommunicate Person to lead a Life more to be dreaded, than Death; nay though the Magistrate, supposing he were of their Communion, <sup>c</sup> is not exempt from this Punishment,

<sup>a</sup> P. 63.

<sup>b</sup> P. 38, 39.

<sup>c</sup> P. 39.

since as a Member of their Society, he is but <sup>d</sup> in a *natural* State, and as subject to it as any Peasant, *over whom in a Society for the Worship of God he hath no more Power, than the Peasant hath over him.*

If he should say, that no Religious Society can oblige any but their own Members to shun their Excommunicates, and avoid all Commerce, and Converse with him, I say the same of the Church; and here therefore must put him in mind of his *artful* way, to call it no worse, of expressing himself, where he declaims upon this Subject in such manner, as if the Clergy, *those Christian Druids*, as he with great Respect calls them, pretended to <sup>e</sup> oblige *every one*, and *all People*, to shun their Excommunicates, and become *the Executioners of their Sentence*; whereas they can command none to do it, but the Members of their own Church. If he saith, that the People of the Church of *England* are the great Body of the Nation, I must tell him that that is only accidental, and that it is his Endeavour, and of many hundreds more, to make her the least of the Tribes, that pretend to Religion among us; and that some of them, who are very numerous, expect their turn once more for a National Church. If he should say, that my reasoning against him from his own Scheme is not just, because the Government of Churches, which he erects upon it, must be in the *whole Body*, and not in any one Order of Men; but that the Government of the Church of *England* is in a particular Order of Men, who call themselves *the Clergy*: I answer, that as to *the Independency* of the governing Power upon the Magistrate, it is all one, whether it be in a particular Order, or in the whole Body, in the Priests, or in the People, because in which of the two soever it is seated, it is an independent Power. Thus the *Quakers*, for instance, meet in vast num-



in Answer to The Rights, &c. cxli

bers among us, not only for Religious Worship, but for Government, and Discipline, for Legislation, and Jurisdiction independently on the Magistrate, and with a witness shun their Excommunicates, or those who seeing their Errour leave their Communion, and oblige FRIENDS all the World over to be the Executioners of their Sentence; but I think they have not hitherto done it upon his Scheme of a *Natural*, but the Pretence of a Divine Right. But our <sup>f</sup> Author hath given them, and all Religious Societies pretending to an *independent Divine Right*, another String to their Bow; and I hope, as he cannot by his own Principles, so he will not deny the Body of the Church the Benefit of it; and then as a Body she is as exempt, and independent on the Magistrate, as even *High Church*, that *Spiritual Babylon*, can wish.

The *Royal Supremacy* must fall down before his *Natural Right*, as *Dagon* did before the Ark, because in Matters of Religion, and the Administration of it, the Magistrate hath no more Power over the meanest Peasant, than the meanest Peasant hath over him. The 25 *H. VIII.* c. 19. can be no bar to this *Natural Right* of the whole Body, tho' he <sup>g</sup> cites it as a bar to the *Divine Right*, which the Clergy claim. The whole Body will have a Power of Ecclesiastical Legislature, be they few, or be they many, be they the *National*, or be they not the *National Church*, independent on our Kings and Queens in or out of Parliament; and they must be protected in their Faith, their Worship, their Articles, their Rites, and Ceremonies; or else their *Natural Right* would authorise them, could they believe it, to call the Magistrate to account for breach of Trust, which they reposed in him. When I speak of the Body of the Church of *England*, I speak strictly of that Body

<sup>f</sup> P. 33.

<sup>g</sup> Pref. p. vii.

made up of the Laity and Clergy, which would at all times of Trial and Distinction adhere to the Doctrine, Worship, Government, and Discipline of their Church, according to which the People believe the Clergy to be by Divine Institution the Governours of the Church, who have the Power of Spiritual Legislation, and Jurisdiction, as well as of Ordination. Such a *Babylonish Church of England* as this in any Condition, or any Place of the World, or consisting of what numbers soever, by his Scheme must have the common Benefit of *Natural Right*, as well as other pretended Churches, and by consequence at home, or abroad, ought to be as perfectly independent of the Magistrate, as they are, and according to his Principle ought to be. *High Church* it self may challenge all her independent Powers by this Right; and all the Acts of Parliament which he cites with so much Pomp of Vanity, and Scorn, but to no purpose, against her, must give place to it. Thus what, he thinks, he hath pulled down with one Hand, he hath built up with the other: And now let the *Magistrate* consider what he hath got by the Change of the *Divine* for the *Natural*, of the *old* for the *new* Claim of Ecclesiastical Power. Let him consider which of the independent Powers, which of the *Babylons* he will chuse, that built upon *Natural*, or that upon *Divine* Right; and in particular, whether he will have the Church of *England* challenge her independent Powers in virtue of this like an humble Matron with Prayers, and Tears, or in virtue of that, like *BELLONA* with her Cask on her Head, and her Sword in her Hand. He <sup>h</sup>saith, that *they who pretend to set up two independent Powers do in effect confound both*. What hath he then done, who instead of one independent Power of the Magistrate hath set up an hundred as independent of him;

who instead of one *Babylon*, as he calls the Hierarchy of the Church, hath set up an hundred *Babels* of Confusion, an hundred, independent ruling *Powers in the same Society, an hundred Souls in the same Body Politick*? These are his own ways of arguing, and by the Laws of Controversy I must demand the benefit of them against himself.

I have already given the Reader Specimens enough of the fraudulent, and contradictory ways of reasoning which this Author useth, and might give many more, were it necessary for me to go through his Book.

Sometimes he argues for the bare possibility of a thing which in fact never was; as of Peoples going out by consent *once upon a time*, he knows not when, out of a State of Nature into a State of Government, contrary to the History of the Creation, which as soon as the *Greeks* came to the knowledge of, they turned from that Pagan Account of Government to the Christian, which taught how Government had its Original from God in one Man, and one Woman the first Parents of Mankind. There never was any absurd Opinion more effectually baffled, and exposed, than this of his in the *Rehearsal* in answer to Mr. *Lock*; but he, as if it were an uncontested Principle, hath built his Book upon it, and the Foundation being false, the Superstructure he hath erected upon it falls to the ground. He tacitly confesses, that Government could not have been so set up by a great number in a State of Nature. Saith he, *if a few at first agreed on a common Umpire, 'twas sufficient, if others by their Actions acknowledged an Authority so advantageous to them.* Here his Meaning is somewhat uncertain: For if by *Few* he means a few of many actually in being at the same time, then he must tell us how a multitude of Men co-existing in

cxliv *A Prefatory Discourse*

a State of Nature, came to give a few their several Authorities to consent for them to go out of the *State of Nature* into a State of Government. But if by a *few* he means two, or three Men, and Women at the first, and no more, and by *others* those who descended from them, then it supposes this grand Absurdity, that Men, and Women born in a State of Government, are born in a State of Nature too, and remain in it till by their Actions at least they'll give their consent to the Government in which they are born. This I think is his meaning. For, *saith he*, why People should not take this way to come out of the *State of Nature at first*, as they have done ever since, *there can be no manner of reason*. This is one of the confident ways of speaking usual with him, against many Reasons to the contrary given in the *Rehearsal*, to which I refer him, and the Reader. And *they*, *saith he*, who make this Objection, that Government could not come at first from Consent, because it cannot be presumed, that all Parties met together to give an express Consent, may as well argue that no Language could be of Human Institution, because Words not signifying any thing naturally, we cannot imagine that all should meet together to agree that such Sounds shall have such Ideas annex'd to them. And yet this depends not only on the Agreement of those, who spoke any Language at first, but of those who have done it since.

This very Comparison shews the precarious, and absurd nature of the Original of Government, according to his Scheme. *First*, it is as precarious to suppose, that a few Men came together to form the *first* Government, as that any number of Men ever came together to form the *first* Language; and both Suppositions are equally contrary to the most philosophical, most rational Scripture-Account both of the Original of Government, and Languages before, and after the Flood. *Secondly*, it is absurd; because as the Agreement of a small number of Men together, *that*  
such



*such Sounds should have such Ideas annexed to them,* supposeth they must have had some common speech in which they understood one another, and came to such an Agreement; so the meeting of a small number of Men and Women together to form Government, and to agree on a common Umpire, supposes an antecedent Consent, and Agreement to meet, and debate, and chuse that Umpire, and form Government; and that antecedent Consent and Agreement, which could not be without Government, must have been before the Government, which he supposeth to be first. And to carry on his comparison in his own words, \* as making *Additions*, or *Alterations* in any Language by the express, or tacit Consent of those who use it, supposes they first had that common Language; so the Consent of a few Men met together to agree upon Government, supposes some antecedent Order, and Government, and Consent to meet, and agree together in passing from the state of Nature to a state of Government, which implies a Contradiction. But admit his worthy Suppositions were not attended with this Absurdity, I am sure it is attended with another, which highly reflects on the Wisdom of God, to put Men into a *State of Nature*, and leave them like *Salvages* to wander up and down in it without any common Language, and to meet together one knows not how, nor when, to *have*, and *have* out their Consent for this or that Form of Government; and agree upon an Umpire, or Trustee, with Conditions that he should be accountable for his Ministry to them; which, to use his own Words, *is to banter the Magistrate with the same Conditions that Trincalo allowed to his Rival Stephano*, when he told him, *Thou shalt indeed be Viceroy over me, provided I be Viceroy over thee*. I am sure, let him say of *Atheists* what he will, a Christian must be little better, that

cxlvi      *A Prefatory Discourse.*

will set up such a Scheme, and ought to be <sup>l</sup> reckoned not only as an Enemy to Christianity, but to all Government, as *subverting the Foundations of both*; <sup>m</sup> and by his own way of reasoning not only the Magistrate, but every Man hath a Right to punish such a Writer, as much as the *Denyers of a Divine Being*, since these are but very little, if at all more injurious to Christianity, and Government, than he.

And as he argues for the possibility of this most absurd Original of Government against another way or matter of Fact, by which it came into the World so <sup>n</sup> elsewhere he reasons against another matter of Fact, of which God was the Author, as ridiculous, impossible, and absurd. This matter of Fact is God's Institution, and Erection of a visible spiritual Kingdom in the Kingdoms of this World, under the Government of Powers distinct from, and independent on the Powers of the World, by which they who are vested with those Powers are made mutually subject to one another. This he positively charges with absurdity: ° *Then, saith he, as to Governours themselves, what can be more absurd, that one can be subject to, and Sovereign of the same Person?* And in <sup>p</sup> another place he compares this Independency of the two Powers, and their mutual Subjection to each other, to the Banter of *Trincalo* in the Play, who allowed his Competitor *Stephano* to be his Viceroy, so he might be Viceroy over him. It is most certain, that if such an Institution be *absurd*, God cannot be the Author of it; and therefore let us enquire, whether indeed it implies *Absurdity*, or Contradiction, for two different Potentates invested with different Powers, to be Subjects, and Superiors to each other; for if it is not absurd, or impossible with Men, we may be sure it is practical, and possible with God. The Question then is,

<sup>l</sup> P. 12.

<sup>m</sup> P. 50.

<sup>n</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>p</sup> P. 60.

Whether two Superiors, or two Sovereigns, may not be subject to one another *in different respects* ; for it is most certain, that in the *same respect*, one cannot be subject, and Sovereign to the same Person, though in different respects he may. So according to his own Scheme of Government, the People appoint the *Magistrate* to be Sovereign over them with the same Condition that *Trincalo* allowed *Stephano* to be Viceroy, provided that they, when they think fit, may be Sovereign over him. Here is the *Magistrate* without any absurdity, as he must acknowledge, in *different respects* Sovereign of, and Subject to his People ; *Sovereign* upon condition he rules well, and *Subject*, when he doth not. Upon the *former* Condition they are accountable to him, but upon the *latter* he is accountable to them ; in *one respect* he hangs them, and in the *other respect* they depose, or behead him. This is no Absurdity with our Author, and yet it must be absurd, though by God's Appointment, for the King to be subject to the Priest in one respect, as the Priest is subject to him in another. But to take no advantage against him from his own Scheme, this great pretended Absurdity hath been, and is daily practised among Men. Kings in different respects have been, and may be mutually Subjects and Sovereigns, as in virtue of their *Feudal* Lands, and Dominions, which they hold of one another. Nay they may be so subject and supreme to each other by having free, or *Alo-dial* Lands, and Lordships in one another's Dominions, and among Subjects, and Superiors of other Societies nothing is more common. My *Lord Mayor* of *London*, as Member of any of the Twelve Companies, is subject to the Master of it, and the Master of it as a Member of the City is subject to him, as *Lord Mayor*. Among the *Romans* the Sons of Families were capable of the great *Magistracies*, while they were under the Power of their Fathers, and

# cxlviii     *A Prefatory Discourse*

Members of their Families ; in which case, when it happened, the Father was subject to the Son in his *Civil*, and the Son to the Father in his *Domestick* Capacity, without any Absurdity in Government. So if the Queen is pleased to confer the Honour of *Knighthood*, or any greater Dignity, on a *Minor* of a Family, whose Father is but a Gentleman, he must have Precedence of his Father abroad, and his Father must take place of him at home. And at Court the same great Officers are subject to those *above-stairs*, who are subject to them *below*. And I need not spend time in shewing how Kings by different Grants or Commissions, can make the same Persons in different respects superior and inferior to one another, and the same Body of Men in different relations subject to two independent Powers, and Jurisdictions. I imagine our Author himself will not deny but that the *Magistrate*, for example a King, or Queen of the Church of *England* may make themselves subject to the Clergy in what we call *Spirituals*, as they are subject to them in *Temporals* ; and if it is possible for the Magistrate himself to do it, I hope it is no *Absurdity*, or Impossibility for God to oblige the Magistrate to that, to which he can oblige himself. If Kings, who are Earthly Sovereigns, can subject the same Society, or same number of Men in different respects and capacities, to two inferior independent Powers ; surely God, who is Lord Paramount, and Supreme above all Kings, may do the same ; and whether he hath done it, or no, is, as I must observe again, a Question about matter of *fact*, which I hope is proved in the following Letters, especially in the *Second*, by the Authority of such Judges <sup>a</sup> as he confesses taught that Doctrine, and the Testimony and Evidence of such Witnesses, as our Author, and his Club, and all their Allies among *Atheists*, *Theists*,



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* cxlix

and Unitarians of all sorts here, or elsewhere in this Age of Latitude, and Innovation, will never be able to counterpoise.

He is very frank in allowing the Magistrate a Power to deprive the Clergy, and with great pleasure insults them again and again with the depriving Acts since the Reign of *Henry VIII.* tho' the Power of depriving, with which he vests the Magistrate against them, be a flat Contradiction to his own Scheme of Government, in which he divests him of it, and to his Notion of Deprivation, which he<sup>r</sup> saith is but an *Agreement in any Church, or Congregation, to hear their Minister no longer, or to own him any more for their Minister*; or as he speaks somewhere else, to let him know *they have no farther occasion for his Service.* To which I answer *ad hominem*, first, that according to his Positions our Kings, or Queens can have no hand in depriving Ministers, but those of the Churches to which they belong, because a Member of one Church cannot vote to deprive the Minister of another. And secondly, that they have no more Power in depriving of their Ministers, than any other Fellow-Member hath; the Ecclesiastical Power in all the Instances of it being, as he affirms, by Natural Right in the<sup>r</sup> whole Body, in which, as I have shewed above, the *Prince* hath no more Power over the *Peasant*, than the *Peasant* hath over him. In like manner neither will his Scheme allow the Members of Parliament any Power to deprive, or depose Ministers, but those of their own Churches, in which the People *without doors*, tho' the Members of both Houses were all of one Church, imagine of the Church of *England*, would have as much Power as they.

I have observed above, that what he hath said against the Revenues of the Church, reflects upon

---

<sup>r</sup> P. 80.

<sup>r</sup> P. 84. 80, 57.

the Wisdom of God, who made such plentiful Provision for the *Jewish* Clergy, even, as Learned Men have computed, to a Fifth part of the Valuation of the whole Land. And I must here observe, that it is expressly contrary to the Scriptures, as any Man may see in 1 *Cor.* ix. and the other Texts cited in the Margin, as also to the constant Practice of the ancient Church, as *Sempil*, *Nettles*, *Tillesly*, and *Montague* have proved against Mr. *Selden*, whose *spiteful Spirit* to the Clergy is descended in a double Portion on this Writer, who will neither allow God, nor the King a Power to settle Revenues upon the Priesthood. I must also observe how he slanders the Clergy in saying, that they claim a Right to the Tenth part of Mens Lands, unless he'll say by *Lands* he meant the Fruits, and Product of the Lands; and to them indeed they may claim a Right from God; who hath, as he thinks he wittily speaks, *packed* them to the Priesthood, as the Authors above mentioned, and many other Learned Men, have proved. Somewhere he speaks of them, as of a robbing of the People, and when time shall serve, he can treat the Lands, and Revenues of the Crown in the same manner, and then will make no difficulty to say, that the People could never *authorize* the Magistrate to receive, or their Representatives to give, such and such burdensome, enormous, and ruinous Taxes, and rob them against their natural Rights, from which they have no Power to recede. His repeated Arguments against the Revenues of the Church, put me in mind of a Story I have heard of the famous *Harry Martin*, who meeting with a worthy Divine of his Acquaintance, that was turned out of his Benefice in those Times, embraced and kissed him, saying in Banter, and Mockery, *My dear Do-*

<sup>c</sup> 1 *Thess.* ii. 6. 2 *Thess.* iii. 9. 2 *Cor.* xi. 9, 12. *Gal.* ii. 6.

<sup>b</sup> P. 17, 22, 23, 25. <sup>w</sup> P. 183. <sup>\* P. 23.</sup>

Et or, how do'st do? I saith I am glad to see thee; for no body loves a POOR Clergy-man better than I do. This kind of Love our Author, and his Gang, have in great store for the Clergy. Could they starve the Men, they think they could soon starve the Order, and quickly get rid of Priests, a sort of Fellows, as one is reported to have said particularly of Bishops, that have troubled the World ever since the Time of the Apostles, and, mangre the Malice of these Men, and the Devil's, I trust, will still trouble it unto the End of the World.

He inveighs in many places against those of the Clergy, who believing the Church to be a Society distinct from the State, and independent of it, think that the Magistrate hath not Power of depriving, though he himself hath taken this Power from him, and makes no difficulty to deny him the Right to issue out Writs *de Excommunicato capiendo*, and by consequence of a Power to make Laws for such Writs. And he commends the Clergy, as he is pleased to mis-call the Presbyterian Ministry of Scotland, for not suffering the Magistrate to back their Excommunication with Temporal Force. To which I will take upon me to reply, that the Magistrate in Scotland hath highly compensated the Kirk for the want of that Assistance, by an Act for taking away Patronage, by another against Toleration, and by another of additional Securities for the Kirk, by which if a Man should write in Scotland against the Kirk, and its Power, and Ministry, as he hath done against the Church in England, he would be soon put in a condition of never writing, or speaking more. I believe, if the Clergy of the Church of England should upon such Terms desire the Magistrate no longer to back their Excommunications, he, if asked, would tell him, that they were most unreasonable, inconsistent with the natural Rights of the People, that they tended to Slavery; and that when Men came out of a State of Nature into a

State of Government, they never gave, nor could give the *Magistrate* such exorbitant, and destructive Power.

He <sup>1</sup> endeavours to prove in several places of his Book, that *no one more than another, Women not excepted, can be reckoned a Priest from Scripture.* This is a great part of a Book published 4 or 5 Years since with this Title: *The Principles of the Protestant Religion explained in a Letter of Resolution to a Lady;* and, <sup>2</sup> as hath been observed, was fully refuted in an Answer, entituled, *the Necessity of Church-Communion*, printed by *A. and J. Churchill* M.DCC.V. and thither I refer the Reader, only I cannot but observe for the Honour of this worthy Author, that it is one of his fraudulent Practices to write after, and out of other Books that have been already, confuted, without taking notice of the Answers to them; as I shall hereafter shew. The Reasons he gives are these: First, *Because the only Sacrifices of our Religion are Prayers, Praises, and Thanksgivings, which every one of the Congregation offers up for himself;* which is a Reason levelled against all Priesthood, the *Jewish* as well as the *Christian*, and the Priesthood of our Lord, and Saviour *Jesus*; to which, as I have observed before, these Men are as much Enemies, as to the Priesthood of his Ministers, through which it is their design to wound that. By this way of reasoning there can be no such Office as a *Master of Requests* to any Earthly Sovereign, because Men who present their Petitions by his hands, also offer them to the King themselves, and when the Priests of the *Jews* offered up Sacrifices for the whole Congregation, or for single Persons, the Offerers also offered them up for themselves, and at

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 108, 130.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England.



the same time our Sovereign *High-Priest* in Heaven intercedes for us when we pray, and makes our Prayers acceptable to God, we also offer up our Prayers for our selves. He farther saith, that every one, as well as the Minister, may *apply the Bread, and Wine to the same holy, and spiritual Use*; so every Man may set or apply the King's *Broad or Privy Seal*; but is every Man commissioned to do it, or can every Man do it with effect, or without Treason? It is not what every Man may, or can *naturally* do, but what he is *lawfully* empowered to do in Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil Societies. But Power of ministring in Churches of his erection, is entirely founded on the *Natural Right*, which every Congregation hath to chuse its own Ministers, Men or Women it matters not; and this Natural Right, he saith, the Primitive Christians made use of in forming of Churches, though, as I have shew'd above, they never mentioned this Natural Right, when they were questioned for what they did; but of the Power, and Right, and Authority that they received from God, as *St. Paul* did in the Salutations of all his Epistles, in his Apologies from the Heavenly Vision, and *Peter*, and *John*, when they said unto the Magistrates, *We ought to obey God rather than Men*. The Apostles never stiled themselves the Servants, and Ministers of the People, in our Author's sense, but of God, and *Jesus Christ*, who was sent from God, and the Peoples Servants for *Jesus* sake.

But against this Divine Right and Commission he hath set up the unalienable *Natural Right*, which he supposes Men brought with them from his precarious, and absurd State of Nature, into a Civil State of Government; and his whole Book, which he hath founded on this Scheme, must sink with it, till he can defend it against what I have said above, and against the *Rebearsal*, who to this present moment hath again and again challeng'd him to defend himself.

‡ He

<sup>a</sup> He hath the Modesty, as he thinks very wittily, to liken a Convocation to my Lord Tumond's Cocks, who, tho' at first sight they seem all of a side, yet are no sooner put together, than they will spur at one another; and that if a Prince had a mind to ruin a Church unperceived, he need only allow a Convocation liberty to sit as long as they pleased. To what I have said above in answer to this spiteful Reflection upon the differences of the Clergy in Synods, and Councils, I will only put him in mind, that LEGION, when they please, can say the same thing of Parliaments, or any other Meeting of Christians, which they did not like, and that there was one, and but one Parliament, whom the Prince allowed to sit as long as they pleased, who ruined both King, Church, and Kingdom, and by their Quarrels and Contentions within doors, brought themselves from two Honourable Houses with the King according to Law at the Head of them, to a most vile, and contemptible Rump in one tyrannical House, cursed by God, and hated by Men. I have heard of a young Lady, who by reading *Romances* became a *She Timon*, because after long Observation she could not find one such *Hero* among Men, as she found in those fictitious Histories; and I think our *Timon* of Priests, and Priesthood, altogether as mad, though not so innocent, as she. For all his Invectives against the Clergy for their Faults, and particularly for their Dissensions in Synods, amounts to no more, than that they are Men, and like other Men, and Christians, when they meet together. But if God would please these malicious, and other peevish Malevolents of the Clergy, he must give them Priests without Human Infirmities, if I may say it, *Romantick* Priests, Priests who have no less, than the ideal Perfection both of Men, and Christians, or else he must over-rule the

Freedom of their Wills, and make them impeccable, and *heroically* good by irresistible Grace. But why do I say, if God would please them? For I have<sup>b</sup> shewed above, if he should make Angelical Men, or Angels Priests, he could not please them, especially if they pretended to make Creeds, or to be sent by God, and to be *his* Ministers, and not the Servants of the People, or to be their Servants only for *Jesus* sake, and by Authority derived from him. I once heard a Debate between two Gentlemen, whereof one was a great Enemy, and the other a Friend to the Clergy. The former inveighed bitterly against them upon the account of their Pride, Covetousness, and other Vices, which our Author is most liberal in charging of them with. After which the latter having said many other things in their defence, prayed him to tell what kind of Men he would have Priests to be. In answer to this, he made a Description of Men in such perfection of Moral, and Christian Vertues, as are not commonly to be found, though sought for with the *Cynick's* Lanthorn. Sir, reply'd the other, I wish to God that not only all Priests, but all Christians were such Men: But pray, Sir, do you know the number of Clergy-men we have in the Nation? No, Sir, said he; but why do you ask that Question? To inform you, reply'd the Friend of the Clergy, there are about twelve thousand Clergy-men in this Nation; and I pray you to consider, if there are *twelve thousand such Men*, or half that number in our whole Country, as you would have Priests to be. In truth, reply'd the other most ingenuously after some pause, I think there are not; but I never considered this before, and hereafter I assure you, Sir, I will never speak against our Clergy, as I have been wont to do.

---

<sup>b</sup> Pref. p. lxxiv.

I leave the Application of this Story to our Author, and his Club, who have exaggerated all the Faults, and Failings of the Clergy in their single, and in their synodical Capacities, without truth, without Mercy, and without making allowances for them, as Men. Amongst the rest, he hath one most invidious, as well as false way of speaking of them through his whole Book, after this manner <sup>c</sup>, *their assuming to themselves the Power, &c. and their putting themselves in the place of God.* And if he pleases he may say the same of my *Lord Mayor*, or any other subordinate Magistrate, that they assume to themselves such, and such Power, and put themselves in place of the King. Nay, he may say the same of our Kings, and Queens, whom the Laws acknowledge to be supreme next under God, that they assume to themselves the Sovereign Power over the People, and put themselves in the place of God, whose Ministers they pretend to be. In truth, there is nothing that he hath said against the *Ecclesiastical*, but what he, and his Party may, and if ever they see a proper time for it, will say against the *Regal Power*; and the very same Artillery by which they have attempted to batter down the *Mitre*, they will, if ever they see a Season for it, turn upon the Crown. The same way of reasoning will serve them as well against *Kingcraft*, and *Kings*, as *Priestcraft*, and *Priests*; and then what Kings, and Emperours have done amiss from *Nimrod* to this day, without any distinction of Reigns, or Persons, shall all be laid to the charge of Kingship, and Kings. The Power of our Kings, and Queens, which our Laws, and Lawyers declare to be independent, they hate as much, and for the same reason, as the independent Power of the Church, and will say of that, as in allusion to another Author, he <sup>d</sup> saith of this, that it is a

<sup>c</sup> P. 84, 85, 93.<sup>d</sup> P. 185.



Millstone which the Clergy hang about the Neck of the Church, and by the monstrous Weight of it do as much as in them lies to sink it.

\* He ridicules Priests for saying they are God's Ambassadors to the People, because they cannot work Miracles to prove their Mission, it being the Prerogative of God alone to chose his own Ambassadors. *Christ, and his Apostles* (saith he) *as they were commissioned by God, so they brought their Credentials with them visible to Mankind, viz. the Power of working Miracles; but what Credential, or what Mission can these Gentlemen pretend to? or what Gospel never known to the World are they to discover?* Is not this pleasant to hear an Infidel, who laughs at Miracles at one time, arguing from them at another? But this he doth in spite to the Clergy, because according to his Scheme they do not take their Mission from the People, and own themselves to be the Servants of the Flocks over whom they are Bishops, and Priests. In answer to which I think I may justly say of this Band of Men, in the Head of which our Author hath put himself against the Clergy, that *an evil, and adulterous Generation seeketh after Signs, and Wonders*, which if they saw, they would not believe. Instead of believing, I have reason to think from what they have published, and from what I hear now and then of their private Conversations, that if our Lord, and his Apostles were to teach the same things, and work the same Miracles among us, which they did among the *Jews*, that they would crucify him, and put them to death. They would tell him, as the *Jews* did, that he was a Blasphemer, that he made himself equal with God, and assumed his Prerogative in forgiving of Sins; that he set up himself, and his independent Power against *Caesar*: And of them they would say, that they put

*themselves in God's place, set up another King, one Jesus, in whose Name they did all things contrary to the Decrees of Caesar, and by a pretended independent Power derived from him, set up one Power and Authority within another in all Places, to clash, and interfere with the Empire, and Imperial Laws. Have I not reason to think so of these Men from what is collected out of their Writings in the *Ax* laid to the Root of Christianity; and in particular from what is there cited out of a Book in great esteem among them, *An account of the Growth of Deism?* wherein the Author saith, *If those Writings which the Clergy call Scriptures, are of their Side, I make no doubt but they were of their own inventing, and if Jesus Christ their Patron laid the Foundation of those Powers, which both Papist and Protestant Clergy claim to themselves under him, I think the old Romans did him right in punishing him with the Death of a Slave.* These are the Powers, the independent Powers, which our Author calls the *Spiritual Babylon*, and I believe every Man, who reads his Book with Observation, cannot but confess, that it is written against those Spiritual Powers, which Christ, and his Apostles, and those whom the Apostles sent, exercised in a manner independent on the Empire, with as much couched Blasphemy and Malice, as the *Growth of Deism*, or any other of their Books more plainly express.*

In the second place, I must be so free as to tell these Gentlemen, that they may as well require the *Credentials of Miracles* from us for our *Doctrines*, as well as for our *Mission*, and equally reject both, because God doth not now bear us witness, as he did to our Lord, and his Apostles, with *Signs and Wonders, and divers Miracles, and Gifts of the Holy Ghost.* Our want of *miraculous Credentials* equally affects both, and I doubt not but it was our Author's intention that it should; but as he must give me leave

leave to tell him, that our Mission is the same that it was in the beginning of the Third Century, when Miracles were ceasing; so it is the same ever since they quite ceased; and I must also remind him, that the more ancient Christians of the following Ages, and we after their example, think not our Mission, or our Doctrines the less credible for want of Miracles; *First*, Because we are as certain, as we can be of any matter of fact, which we do not see, that the Truth of both was sealed by many Miracles for succeeding Ages: *Secondly*, Because our Lord foretold us, that we were to believe upon the Testimony of Miracles not seen, when he said to *Thomas*, who doubted of his Resurrection, *Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed, blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*

In the third place, I desire to know of our Author what *miraculous Credentials* the Jewish Priests had under the second Temple, or the Scribes, and Pharisees, who sat in *Moses's* Chair in our Saviour's time? Both these Orders of Men were as destitute of Miracles, and as wicked too, as any Christian Priests, our Author can delight to shew; and yet after so many Ages, and Vicissitudes, our Lord sent the People with their Offerings to the former, and bid them observe what the latter bid them do, though they taught the *Old Law*, the Law of *Moses*, without Miracles to vouch their Authorities, as we now teach the Law of Christ. Wherefore, as the Magistrates of any Town Corporate, made a Corporation five or six hundred Years ago, pretend to act by the same Commission, which their first Predecessors receiv'd from the Crown, though it may be they have not all their Credentials to shew, as the first *Ensigns of Honour*, and Power, and are destitute of many other

---

<sup>1</sup> *Origen contra Celsum*, lib. 2. p. 62. Τεργσία, ὡς καὶ ἰχθυὶ ἐν τοῖς ὡδοῖς χριστιανῶς δεῖσθαι, &c.

Solemnities, by which the Authority of the first Magistrates was publicly notified to the People; so we now pretend to the same Mission, and Commission, that Christ gave the Apostles, and the Apostles gave to their next Successors, and they to theirs, though we have not the same Credentials of Miracles, which not for ever, but only for some time were necessary to notify and prove the Mission, and Doctrines of the Apostles, and of those they ordained, and their Power and Authority, not only to gather, constitute, and govern Churches; but, as Christians every where believed, by successive Ordinations to leave the same Power to others to govern the Church of God in all places unto the end of the World.

Also in those early Times of the Church, while Christianity was in its Infant-state, God gave the Credentials of Miracles to all Believers of both Sexes, to convince Unbelievers of the Truth of the Christian Religion; and therefore by requiring Miracles of the Clergy now for a proof of their Mission this Man hath taught *Atheists, Theists, and Scepticks* of all sorts to demand of Christians in general the same proof of their Religion; and I cannot but think from the nature of his Objection against our Mission, which he makes openly, that he makes the same in his Heart against the Religion, which we teach. After objecting the want of Miracles to justify our Commission, he asks, *What Gospel never known to the World we are to discover?* <sup>b</sup> This is a Question

---

<sup>b</sup> Bp. *Stillingsfleet*, in his excellent Sermon preached at a publick Ordination, in answer to this Objection writes thus: *If Christ appointed Preachers only for the Conversion of Infidels, this Argument would have great force; but the Apostle tells us, that he appointed in his Church, not only Apostles, and Evangelists, but Pastors, and Teachers for the Perfecting, &c. Therefore as long as the Church is in its imperfect state, as long as it may want Unity, or Knowledge,*



Question as full of Folly as Malice, and in truth not worthy of an Answer; and I should scarce have taken notice of it, but that it hath been asked by some since he published his Book, who hate the Clergy as much as himself, and I shall give the same Answer to it: That as long as there are new Generations of Men succeeding one another, so long it will be needful to have the same Order of Men, who taught the Gospel from the beginning, to keep up and continue the knowledge of it in all Countries where it is known, and to discover it to Countries, where it was never known, that all the Kingdoms of the Earth may become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.

I have now said much more in answer to the *Rights of the Christian Church*, than at first I intended. But before I take leave of this *Vatinus* of Priests, and Priesthood, I think my self obliged by some Examples to detect his false, and fraudulent Citations, that the World may farther see, what kind of Men they are, who thus set up themselves against the Ecclesiastical Orders, and the spiritual Power of the Church.

In p. 338, he cites *Eutychnus*, whose Authority Mr. Selden made use of before him, to prove that the *Alexandrian Church* for the first 235 Yeats had no Bishops, but such as were ordained by imposition of the Hands of the Presbyters only. There never was a Falsity more effectually, or more often refuted at home, or abroad, than this. As first by

---

or Improvement, this Office of Teachers is to continue.——Can any think such a Work to be now unnecessary, as long as Men have Consciences to be awakened, Errors to be confuted, Vices to be reformed, &c.——While the Souls of those under our Care are in such perpetual danger, &c. When should Pilots, &c.——Is it time then to say there is no need of Pilots now, for the Ship will steer it self, and the Mariners cannot fail of their Duty, as long as the Coasts are known, the Rocks have been discovered to them.

*Abr. Ecchellenfis* at Rome, in his <sup>1</sup> Learned Work cited in the Margin. Secondly, by *Morinus* in the vii<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the third part of his learned <sup>2</sup> Book *de sacris Ecclesie ordinationibus*, p. 151. I have cited *Ecchellenfis* before *Morinus*, because he wrote to him to know his Opinion of *Selden's Origines Ecclesie Alexandrina*; in answer to which Letter, as afterwards in his Book, he shewed how falsely and fallaciously *Selden* had translated *Eutychius* by *in Provinciae Egypti*, for *in provincia Egypti*, and by *¶ primus fuit hic parriareba Alexandrinus, qui Episcopus fecit*, instead of <sup>1</sup>, *¶ est primus Patriarcha, qui in Alexandria fecit Episcopos*. And there are more such Instances of Mr. *Selden's* Ingenuity in *Ecchellenfis's* Answer to his Book. Thirdly, This Falsity hath been convicted by two Learned Men of our Country, Dr. *Hammond*, and Bishop *Pearson*. By the former in the Tenth Chapter of his third *Dissertation* against *Blondel*, to which *Dalle* never made any Reply; and by the latter in the X<sup>th</sup> and XI<sup>th</sup> Chapters of the former part of his *Vindicia Epist. S. Ignatii*, first printed at Cambridge 1672, and since by *Le Clerc* at Antwerp M.DCC. I mention all these Answers to *Selden's Eutychius*, and the several Editions of Bishop *Pearson's Vindicia*, to shew that our Author could not be ignorant of some of them; and if he were not, what hath he to answer to God, and honest Men, for citing a Book so miserably baffled, especially by Bp. *Pearson*, whose Vindication of *Ignatius's* Epistles is, and ever will be a Defence of the Church against all such Books, which he, and his Accomplices can write.

<sup>1</sup> *Eutychius vindicatus, sive responsio ad Johannis Seldeni Origines Alexandrinas*. Authore Abrahamo Ecchellenſi, Maronita è Libano, Romæ typis S. Congr. de prop. fide. 1661.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in fol. at Paris M.DC.LV.

<sup>1</sup> I. e. Demetrius est primus Patriarcha, qui in Aegypto propriè dicta sibi immediate subjecta, Episcopos creavit.

In p. xxxvii of his Preface, to prove that the Bishops of the Reformation disowned all independent Power, he cites the 25 H. 8. c. 19. and saith, that it was enacted at the request of the Clergy, and penned in the very Words of their Petition; and there can be no greater Argument (saith he) of their disowning all independent Power. Here are several Artifices in this Citation, as first to cite, as Popish Writers are wont to do, the Bishops who made their Submission to Henry VIII. as Bishops of the Reformation, tho' in their Grant to the King of 100000 Pounds for the Release of the *Premunire*, " they complemented his Majesty greatly for writing against the Enemies of the Papal Church, particularly against Luther. Secondly, In saying it was enacted at their request: For it was not enacted " till near two Years after they made their Submission. Till that time, saith my Author, it bound them, as their own Act and Promise only, without any Penalty annexed to the breach of it; and it might have been questioned, whether this Promise was not Personal, and did not die with the Makers of it. But in March 1533. a Statute passed, which perpetuated the Submission, and obliged all their Successors under pain of *Præmunire*. To this I must add what the same Author (who hath given an accurate Account of the Clergy's Submission, and of the first step to it in their Recognition of the King's Supremacy) saith in " another place: In no Submission of theirs are there any Words, which expressly, and in terms, bind the future Clergy; and had this Act of theirs extended to their Successors, yet all they did in H. VIII's Reign, was undone again by them in the Reign of Queen Mary, when the Clergy in Convocation of the Statute of Submission, petitioned for a Repeal of it, and

---

" *The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation*, by Dr. Atterbury, second Edition, 1701. p. 514.

" *Ibid.* p. 95.

" p. 98.

obtained it. And tho' it was revived afterwards, 1 Eliz. yet was not that revival at the instance, or with the expresse consent of the Clergy; and therefore they stand bound at present by no Act of their own, but by the Temporal Law only. This shews that that Act was neither at first made, nor afterwards revived at the request of the Clergy; and then it can be no Argument of their disowning an independent Power; but only of their chusing all along to submit to the Act, rather than to throw themselves into a Persecution. Furthermore, the aforesaid Act of 25 H. 8. c. 19. was so far from being made at their Request, that their Act of Submission, whose Words it recites, was obtained, or rather extorted, with great difficulty from them, as appears by the regular, and exact account of it in the <sup>p</sup> said Book, more especially from their several replies to the *Supplication of the Commons*; and that they never intended to disown their independent Power, which before they had exercised, is plain from their last <sup>q</sup> *Form of Submission*, in which they made their Promises in trust, and confidence to the King: *We your Majesty's humble Subjects, &c. having our trust and confidence in your excellent Wisdom, your Princely Goodness, and fervent Zeal, &c. and also in your Learning far exceeding, &c. and doubting nothing, but that the same shall still continue, and daily increase in your Majesty; first do offer, and promise, &c.*

So also their Recognition of the King's Supremacy was not absolute, as the Statute 26 H. VIII. c. 1. represents it to be, but conditional, with this Limitation: *Cujus singularem protectorem, unicum, & supremum Dominum, & quantum per Christi legem licet etiam supremum Caput, ipsius Majestatem recognoscimus.* With this Clause of Restriction the

<sup>p</sup> From p. 86, to p. 99.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. p. 514.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. p. 537.



Learned <sup>c</sup> Dr. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, signed it, who afterwards, when he saw in what a boasting, and boundless manner the King exercised his new Supremacy, denied it, for which with great cheerfulness, and satisfaction, as Sir Tho. More afterwards did, he suffered Death.

The Bishop of Sarum, in his <sup>c</sup> *History of the Reformation*, observes that the Supremacy was not a point of State, but a matter of Conscience. And in his *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation*, printed, 1688. he hath said many things of it, and the Submission of the Clergy, to which I refer our Author for an Answer to his *Preface*, in which, if a Man may judge by his way of writing, he surely thinks he hath confounded the *Legislation* and *Jurisdiction* of the Church of England, as a Spiritual Society, with the Statutes relating to those two points. The Bishop is a Writer of great Authority with him; he cites and adorns him very often, and therefore I hope he will take great notice of what I am going to present him out of his *Reflections*, as well as because they were written against a clandestine Papist, <sup>c</sup> O. W. with whom the Author of the *Rights* is said to have conversed much, and it may be suck'd the Venom from him, which he hath been spitting upon the Church of England from that time to this.

I begin with the III<sup>d</sup> Chapter, which hath this Title: *Some general Considerations on the Regal Supremacy, that was raised so high at the Reformation.*

<sup>c</sup> Our Author hath brought together many Acts of Parliament with their pompous Preambles, that seem to carry the King's Power in Ecclesiastical Matters to a very indefinite degree, and upon all this he *triumphs* often, as if this was so im-

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 84. Marg.

<sup>c</sup> Mr. Obadiah Walker.

<sup>c</sup> Vol. I. Book III. p. 354.

proper, that it alone is enough to blast the whole Reformation.

Our Author is much more concerned to justify all Papal Bulls, than we can be to justify all the Words of our Laws; especially the *Rhetorick* that is in their Preambles. If he believes the Pope infallible, the general Parts of Bulls that set forth the Doctrine of the Church, are such solemn Declarations, that he must be determined by them. But at lowest he believes the Popes to be the Centers of the Catholick Unity, and all Bishops are bound by Oath to obey all their Decrees and Ordinances. Now when our Author will undertake to justify all the Preambles of Bulls that are in the *Bullarium*, then we may undertake to justify all the *Flourishes* that may be in any Act of Parliament.

When any Authority is asserted in general and indefinite Terms, these are always to be understood with those Restrictions and Limitations that the nature of things require to be supposed, even when they are not expressed. St. Paul expresses the Obedience of Wives to their Husbands in terms so extremely extended, that as *"the Church is subject unto Christ, so ought the Wives be to their own Husbands in every thing"*. He expresses also the Duty of Children in as comprehensive terms. *"Children obey your Parents in all things"*. Now if one would draw Inferences from the extent of these words, he might, taking the liberty that our Author takes upon some of the Expressions that are in our Acts of Parliament, represent the Authority that St. Paul vests both in Husbands and Parents, as a very boundless, and a very extravagant thing. This is enough to shew, that in all those large Phrases of Obedience, there are some necessary Reserves and Exceptions to be under-

stood; and if this Qualification is necessary, even in Writings that were inspired, it is no wonder if some of the *Rhetorick of our Acts of Parliament* wants a little of this Correction.

It is a very unreasonable thing to urge some general Expressions, or some *Stretches of the Royal Supremacy*, and not to consider that more strict Explanation that was made of it, both in K. *Henry the VIII<sup>th</sup>*'s time, and under Q. *Elizabeth*; that were so clear, that if we had to do with Men that had not resolved before-hand not to be satisfied, one would think there could be no room for any farther cavilling. In K. *Henry*'s time the extent of the King's Supremacy was defined in the *necessary Erudition of a Christian Man*, that was set forth as the Standard of the Doctrine of that time; and it was upon this that all People were obliged to take their measures, and not upon some Expressions either in Acts of Parliament, or Acts of the Convocation, nor upon some *Stretches of the King's Jurisdiction*. In this then it is plainly said, That with relation to the Clergy, the King is to oversee them, and to cause that they execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, and especially in those Points, which by Christ and his Apostles was committed to them: And to this it is added, That Bishops and Priests are bound to obey all the King's Laws, not being contrary to the Laws of God. So that here is expressed that necessary Reserve upon their Obedience, it being provided, that they were only bound to obey, when the Laws were not contrary to the Laws of God. The other Reserve is also made of all that Authority which was committed by Christ and his Apostles to the Bishops and Priests; and we are not ashamed to own it freely, that we see no other Reserves upon our Obedience to the King besides these: So that these being here specified, there was an unexceptionable Declaration made

of the Extent of the King's Supremacy ; yet be-  
 cause the term, *Head of the Church*, had something  
 in it that seemed harsh, there was yet a more ex-  
 press Declaration made of this matter, under  
 Q. *Elizabeth*, of which indeed our Author hath  
 taken notice ; tho' I do not find he takes notice of  
 the former, which he ought to have done, if he  
 had intended to have represented this matter sin-  
 cerely to the World (which I confess seems not to  
 have troubled him much.) The Explanation made  
 by Q. *Elizabeth* is so express, that even our Au-  
 thor cannot find any advantage against the Words  
 themselves, but acknowledges that they are such  
 general Terms, that the Article it self may be  
 subscribed by all sides. Since then the declared  
 Sense of those general and extended Expressions  
 that are in some Acts of Parliament, is such, that  
 there lies no just Exception against it ; and since  
 this Sense was not only given by Q. *Elizabeth*, who  
 allowed such as took the Oath to declare that they  
 took it in that sense ; but it was afterwards enacted  
 both in Convocation, and in Parliament, and put  
 into the Body of our Confession of Faith ; This  
 Explanation must be considered as the true mea-  
 sure of the King's Supremacy, and the wide Ex-  
 pressions in the former Laws must be understood  
 to be restrained by this, since posterior Laws de-  
 rogate from those that were at first made. So  
 that according to all this, the King's Supremacy  
 doth not give to our Princes the ministering either of  
 God's Word, or of the Sacraments. — But that only  
 Prerogative, which we see to have been given always to  
 all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself ;  
 that is, That they should rule all Estates and Degrees  
 committed to their Charge by God, whether they be Ec-  
 clestialtical or Temporal, and restrain with the Civil



\* *Sword the Stubborn and the Evil-doers.* This is all  
 \* that Supremacy which we are bound in Conscience  
 \* to own; and if the *Letter of the Law, or the Stretches*  
 \* of that in the *Administration of it*, have carried  
 \* this farther, we are not at all concerned in it: But  
 \* in case any such thing were made out, it could  
 \* amount to no more than this, That the *Civil Power*  
 \* had made some *Encroachments on Ecclesiastical Au-*  
 \* *thority*; but the *submitting to an Oppression, and the*  
 \* *bearing it till some better Times may deliver us from*  
 \* *it, is no Argument against our Church*: On the con-  
 \* trary, it is a proof of our Temper and Patience,  
 \* and of that Respect we pay to that Civil Autho-  
 \* rity which God hath set over us, even when we  
 \* think that it *passeth its bounds*. But all that we are  
 \* bound to acknowledge in the King's Supremacy, is  
 \* so well limited, that our Author hath nothing to  
 \* object to it.

\* So that upon the whole matter, if the great and  
 \* unmeasured Extent of the Papal Authority, made  
 \* our Princes judge it necessary to secure themselves  
 \* from those Invasions, by *stretching their Juris-*  
 \* *diction* a little too much; on the other hand,  
 \* those who have submitted so tamely to the one,  
 \* have no reason to reproach us for bearing the o-  
 \* ther Servitude, even supposing that we granted  
 \* that to be the Case. And if in the time of our  
 \* Reformation, some of our Bishops, or other Wri-  
 \* ters, have carried the Royal Supremacy too far,  
 \* either in Acts of Convocation, or in their Wri-  
 \* tings, as those things are personal Matters, in  
 \* which we are not at all concerned, who do not  
 \* pretend to assert an Infallibility in our Church;  
 \* so their excess in this was a thing so natural, that  
 \* we have all possible reason to excuse it, or at least  
 \* to censure it very gently. For as all Parties and

\* Persons are carried by a Bias very common to  
 \* Mankind, to magnify that Authority which fa-  
 \* vours and supports them; so the Extreame of the  
 \* Papal Tyranny, and the Ecclesiastical Power that  
 \* had formerly prevailed, might have carried them  
 \* a little too far into the opposite Extreame, of rai-  
 \* \* *sing the Civil Power too high.*

\* Upon which he argues two things, (1.) The  
 \* *Clergy's binding themselves never to make any Deci-*  
 \* *sions in matters of Faith or Worship, till they had first*  
 \* *obtained the consent of the Secular Governor.* (2.) The  
 \* *Clergy's authorizing the Secular Governor, or those*  
 \* *whom he should nominate, to determine those matters*  
 \* *in their stead.*

\* It is certain, no Clergy in the World can  
 \* make any such Deputation; and if any have  
 \* done it, it was a Personal Act of theirs, which  
 \* was null of it self, and did not indeed bind those  
 \* who made it, it being of its own nature unlaw-  
 \* ful, but much less can it bind their Successors.

To these Passages I think fit to add what his Lord-  
 ship hath said of the Prince's Power to depose the  
 Clergy, because *The Rights* hath as it were mar-  
 shalled up the depriving Acts in Battel-array a-  
 gainst them, and frequently reproached them with  
 Suspension, Deprivation, and Incapacity by, and  
 from the Civil Power.

\* The Third Thesis is, *That the Prince cannot depose*  
 \* *any of his Clergy, without the consent of the major*  
 \* *part of the Clergy, or their Ecclesiastical Superiars,*  
 \* *and in particular of the Patriarch.*

\* In this the matter must still be reduced to the  
 \* former Point; either the Grounds of such a Deposi-  
 \* tion are in themselves just, or not; if they are just,  
 \* the Prince may as lawfully hinder any Church-man  
 \* from corrupting his Subjects, while he is supported

by a Publick Authority, or a settled Revenue, as he may hinder a Man that hath the Plague on him, from going about to infect his People; for his deposing such a one is only the taking the Civil Encouragement from him; but when this is done unjustly, it is without doubt an Act of high Oppression in the Prince; and as for the Person deposed, and those over whom he was set, they are to consider according to the Rules of Prudence, whether the present Case is of such Importance, that it will balance the Inconveniences of their throwing themselves into a state of Persecution; for it is to be confessed that Church-men have by their Office an indefinite Authority of feeding the Flock, which cannot be dissolved by any Act of the Prince's; but the appropriating this to such a Precinct, and the supporting it by Civil Encouragements, is a human thing, and is therefore subject to the Sovereign Power. But of what he said in the last four Lines I shall say no more here, than that I think they seem to call for his Lordship's second Thoughts, and farther Explication.

In p. 107. he most impudently, as well, as falsely cites *Tertullian de cor. militis*, to prove that receiving the Eucharist from the Hand of the Bishop was an Innovation, whereas the contrary is most evident from the Father's Words, which are these; *Eucharistia Sacramentum & in tempore Victus & omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam Antelucanis Cælibus, Nec de aliorum manu, quam præsentium sumimus.* We receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist commanded by the Lord to be received at the time of [our Love-feast] Meals [in the Evening] and at all times, in our [Morning] Assemblies before day, but we receive it from the Hands of none, but of the Bishops.

The next Citation in which I tax him of want

of Ingenuity, and Fraud, is that in which he puts  
 a Bp. Bull with *Petavius, Curcellanus, Cudworth,* and  
*Le Clerc,* to prove that the Doctrine of the *Nicene*  
*Fathers was not that there is only one Divine Essence in*  
*Number, but in Kind.* He might with as much  
 Modesty, Truth, and Ingenuity, have named this  
 great Defender of the *Nicene* Faith, and Fathers,  
 with *Socinus, Episcopius,* and *Sandius,* against whom  
 he hath written, as well as against *Petavius* by  
 Name, as may be seen in the *Proœmium* of his *Defen-*  
*sio fidei Nicene,* as well as in his *Judicium Ecclesiæ Ca-*  
*tholicæ,* which he wrote on purpose against *Episco-*  
*pium,* of whom he gives this Character in the *Proœ-*  
*mium* to his *Defensio &c. Simon Episcopius cetera do-*  
*ctissimus, sed in Antiquitate Ecclesiastica plane hospes.*  
 To which I must add what he saith of *Episcopius's*  
 Censure of the Council of *Nice,* and the other Councils  
 which maintained the *Nicene* Confession, that they were  
 led on by *Fury, Faction, and Madness: Qui vero, in-*  
*quam ego, &c.* But who, say I, doth not perceive,  
 that these things must proceed from a Mind which  
 is not so sound, or so composed, as it ought to  
 be? For how could it become a sober and a modest  
 Man thus to tear and rend with Slanders the Ve-  
 nerable Prelates of the most August Synod? But  
 now to the matter. He is not ashamed to say, that  
 the *Nicene* Creed was made in a heat, by the *Fury*  
 and the *Factionousness* of a Party, without Sense,  
 or any Consideration. But the Emperor *Constan-*  
*tine,* who presided in the said Synod of *Nice,* ex-  
 pressly testifieth in an Epistle to the Churches  
 concerning the same Council, that he being him-  
 self present in it, *All matters were therein discussed*  
*with all due Examination.* The same Emperor in  
 an Epistle to the Church of *Alexandria* in par-

<sup>a</sup> P. 196, 197.

<sup>b</sup> Ap. Euseb. de vita Constant. L. III. c. 17.



*in Answer to The Rights, &c. clxxiii*

ticular, which is found in the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates, says, that he himself, among the Nicene Bishops, and as it were one of their Number, and their Fellow-Servant, did, being present, so undertake the Examination of the Truth, as that all things, which might bear a shew of, or administer occasion for a doubtful or ambiguous Sense, or Difference of Sentiments, might be accurately discussed. To which Epistle of Constantine Socrates adds this Remark: *Ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς, &c.* Now the Emperor wrote after this manner to the People of Alexandria, hereby teaching them, that the Council's Definition concerning the Faith was not slightly and rashly, but maturely and deliberately, after a diligent Inquiry and full Examination, determin'd: And that there was not notice taken of some Arguments, and others passed by, or silently suppressed, but that all whatever could be brought for the Proof or Disproof of the Doctrine to be established, was fairly produced and canvassed openly. Neither was any thing by them simply, or inconsiderately defin'd; but all was in the first place accurately sifted and examin'd into. Nay even Eusebius himself, who seems to have had the next place in the Nicene Assembly to the Emperor (a Writer of very great Integrity, of a temperate and moderate Genius, and no wise partial against the Arians) expressly relates, how that All the Bishops did subscribe to the Faith agreed on in that Council, *ἐκ ἀνέξεως*, not rashly and without consideration, but after an accurate, deliberate, and diligent Examination of all the several Sentiments made in the Presence of the Emperor: And particularly to the very Clause itself of the *Consubstantiality*, or the *Ὁμοῦσι*, with their unanimous Consent. See the Epistle of Eu-

\* Lib. I. cap. 9. p. 30. Ed. Vales.  
 Valesius ad Euseb. Lib. III. de vit. Const. c. 11.

\* See the Notes of

\* Eusebius

clxxiv. *A Prefatory Discourse*

<sup>c</sup> *sebins* to those of his Diocese extant in the First  
<sup>c</sup> Book of the Ecclesiastical History of *Socrates*,  
<sup>c</sup> Chap. viii. At the beginning indeed of the Coun-  
<sup>c</sup> cil there were some no small Strivings among cer-  
<sup>c</sup> tain of the Bishops; but which were soon pacified  
<sup>c</sup> and laid to sleep by means of the Emperor's most  
<sup>c</sup> pious and obliging Speech; as the same *Eusebins*  
<sup>c</sup> doth also witness.

I have transcribed this Passage in answer to that  
of *Episcopius*, because he hath cited it after another  
such of *Le Clerc's*, p. 199. and because it confirms what  
I have said before from Ecclesiastical History, in an-  
swer to these slanderous Citations out of these, and  
other such Writers, who will ever have an ill-will  
against the *Nicene Fathers*, and all that adhere to  
their Exposition of the Christian Faith. But tho'  
this Learned Bishop hath been the Champion of that  
Council, and its Confession, against all the *Arian*,  
<sup>b</sup> *Popish*, or Protestant, or *Socinian* Writers of this  
Age, to the time of Writing his Books, for which  
he received the thanks of the Assembly of the Cler-  
gy of the *Gallican Church*; yet our Author hath  
reckoned him among those, of whom he saith, <sup>a</sup> as  
often as I consider this, I cannot without Indignation,  
and Horror, reflect upon their stupendous Ignorance, or  
rather Madness, who have made no difficulty to misre-  
present the *Nicene Fathers* as malicious or ignorant De-  
pravers of the Catholick Doctrine concerning Jesus  
Christ, which was delivered by the Apostles, and Ob-  
truders of a new Faith upon the Christian World. Nay,  
this our Author hath done against his Declaration of  
his Intention in writing that noble *Defence*: <sup>a</sup> This is  
the scope, and design of my Undertaking in this Work, to  
shew clearly, that all the approved Fathers, and Doctors  
of the Church, who lived from the time of the Apostles

<sup>a</sup> *As Petavius.* See the Proœmium to the Bishop's *Defensio*, p. 51  
col. 1. <sup>b</sup> *Ibid.* p. 2. col. 1. <sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3.

to the Council of Nice, taught the very same Doctrine; tho' sometimes in different Words, and different ways of speaking, that the Nicene Fathers did of the Godhead of the Son against Arius, and other Hereticks.

This shews the *Genius*, I should have said the evil *Genius* of these Men, who can thus abuse a living Author, whose Works have been lately reprinted with as much, if not with more notoriety, than any Book of the same time.

To these I might add his other fraudulent Citations out of Authors, which have been effectually answered, without taking notice of the Answers, of which to his dishonour I gave a remarkable Instance in his Quotations to blacken Archbishop Laud. So he quotes a Passage out of *Amyntor*, which Mr. Toland cited with an evil intention out of a very Learned Author, to discredit the Authority of the *Scripture-Canon*, though there was never a better Answer written, than it received in two Impressions of a Book entituled, *The Canon of the Scripture vindicated, in answer to the Objections of J. T. in his AMYNTOR*, by John Richardson, London 1701.

So he hath trump up anew the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the Abbot of *Hye*, to whom, though but a Presbyter, he saith, the *Scottish* Bishops were subject, and cites *Bede* in the Margin for his Authority; though this monkish Dream of an ancient Church-Government in Scotland by Presbyters, and the whole Story of the *Culdees* had been twenty Years before most clearly, and learnedly confuted by Dr. William Lloyd, then Bishop of St. Asaph, in his Book entituled, *An Historical Account of Church-Government, as it was in Great-Britain, and Ireland, when they first received the Christian Religion*. With like impudence to destroy the distinction betwixt the Laity, and Clergy, and to prove that Lay-men

clxxvi      *A Prefatory Discourse*

might exercise the Priestly-Office, he cites <sup>m</sup> that famous Passage out of *Tertullian de Cast.* though the Argument taken from that Passage for the Priesthood of the Laity, and the Administration of the Sacraments by Lay-Men, had been fully, and irrefragably answered many Years before by Mr. *H. Dodwell*, in his Book, entituled, *De jure Laicorum Sacerdotali ex Sententia Tertulliani—Dissertatio.* LONDINI, MDCLXXXV.

So hath he very frequently cited Bp. *Stillingsfleet's Irenicum*, though he is forced <sup>n</sup> to confess that the *Appendix* to the second Edition <sup>o</sup> runs counter to it, he means his *Discourse concerning the Power of Excommunication*, of which he saith, *the whole design of it is to maintain that Doctrine of two independent Powers, which he had so much exploded in his Book.* To what purpose then did he cite the *Irenicum*, not only in this place of his Preface referred to in the Margin, but so often after in his Book, against the Church, if, <sup>p</sup> as he is forced to confess, the Author hath since told us, *that he knows no Incongruity in admitting an Imperium in Imperio, and that the Magistrate's Power is cumulative not privative.* I can scarce forbear to cite the whole Passages, which he hath curtailed, because they run as counter to the Rights, as he saith they do to the *Irenicum*; and let him write never so often, and never so much, that Discourse of Excommunication, wherein the Church is proved to be a Society of a quite different Original from the *Commonwealth*, and distinct from it, will be a Confutation of what he writes. But besides his *Discourse of Excommunication*, that Great Man afterwards published several Pieces as counter to his *Irenicum*, as that of Excommunication, viz. *The Unreasonableness of Separation*, at London M.DC.LXXXI.

<sup>m</sup> P. 168, 169.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> Pref. p. liv.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid.



*in Answer to The Rights, &c. clxxvii*

9 *The Charge to the Clergy of his Diocess at his primary Vistation. His Sermon preached at a publick Ordination, March 5. 1684. out of which I will present him this Passage: For the Church is a Society in its Nature, Design, Duty, Offices, Censures, really distinct from any Human Institution. And no Christian, who believes, that the Kingdom of the Messias was to be an external, visible Kingdom, can be of another Opinion. And although Christ be the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and therefore, as Kings, they are subject to him; yet that Authority which Christian Kings do exercise over their Subjects, doth not overthrow the Rules, and Orders, which himself hath established in his Church; for no Power derived from him can void, or destroy his own Laws, and Institutions. Since then the Church doth subsist by virtue of Christ's own Appointment, and that Church is to have peculiar Officers to instruct and govern it, it must follow that even in a Christian Kingdom the Church is a Society distinct from the Commonwealth. This is as counter to his *Irenicum*, as any thing in his *Discourse of Excommunication*, in which he hath proved, first, that the Church is a peculiar Society in its own nature distinct from the Commonwealth. Secondly, That its Power over its Members doth not arise from mere Confederation; or Consent of Parties. Thirdly, That this Power of the Church extends to the Exclusion of Offenders from the Privileges of it. And, fourthly, That the fundamental Rights of the Church do not escheat to the Commonwealth upon their being united into a Christian State. But to return from this Digression to that Excellent Sermon, the Author of it, whose *Irenicum* he hath so often cited, made an *Apology* for his writing of it in the Epistle Dedicatory to the Bishop of London. He there pleads his younger Years, in which he wrote it,*

---

\* In his Ecclesiastical Cases, Vol. I. from p. 5. to p. 12.

# clxxviii    *A Prefatory Discourse*

and the *Time* when it was written, before the Church was re-establiſh'd, the *Design* with which he wrote it, to gain upon Dissenters by overthrowing the *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery, and shewing them, that *Prelacy*, which they detested as unlawful, was a lawful Government; upon which account he tells us, his Superiours made him allowances for the *Scepticalness*, and *Injudiciousness* of his *Youth*, and *Prejudices* of his *Education*. But if he had formally retracted it, it had been all one to a Man, whose Hatred to the Church, and Ecclesiastical Power, makes him cite any thing from any Author, tho' upon second thoughts, and farther Reading, and Consideration, he afterwards refutes, or retracts it, so it sounds well against the Clergy, and the Church. Surely our Author could not be ignorant of all these Pieces, in which that very famous and Learned Man hath like an *High-flyer* written so many things contrary to the Principles of his *Irenicum*; but if he had read but one of them, in which so much is written for *High-Church*, he cannot be excused from *Fourberie*, for so often citing the Book of his younger Age, after the publishing of which, when he had better considered the Constitution of the Church in his riper Years, he wrote to prove her to be a *distinct Society* of Christ's Foundation, and to vindicate her Power, as such. So false is also what our Author also<sup>r</sup> saith, that there is no way to evade his Arguments taken from the Laws, to prove that the *Power*, and *Jurisdiction* of our Bishops is derived mediately from the Parliament, and immediately from the King; but by making the Church a private Society, and allowing no more Power to belong to it than to other private Companies, and Clubs; and consequently, that all the Right any one hath to be an Ecclesiastical Officer, and the Power he is intrusted with, depends on the Consent of the

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* clxxix

*Parties concerned, and is no greater, than they can bestow.*

To which I answer first, that the Church is not a *private voluntary Society*, as he dreams, but, as I hope I have shewn it to be, a publick Society of Christ's Institution for the whole World, and under Officers and Governours of his own appointment, of which universal Society all Men, to whom the Gospel is revealed, are bound to become Members, under pain of eternal Damnation. *Secondly*, that those Officers, and Governours, derive their Power and Jurisdiction from Christ, and that in our Church they exercised it about a thousand Years before the late Laws, from which he takes his Arguments, were made, or perhaps so much as thought of by former Christian States. *Thirdly*, That the same Officers and Governours, in other Countries, do now by Authority derived from Christ, exercise their Powers of Legislation, and Jurisdiction; and have formerly exercised them in making Canons, censuring unruly Members, constituting and ordaining Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, without such restraining Laws. *Fourthly*, That those restraining Laws do no more prove the Ecclesiastical Power to be derived from the Civil, than if the like Laws were made to restrain the Exercise of the *Paternal* Power, it would prove that Fathers had not their Power and Authority from God. The State, or Commonwealth, if it pleases, may declare that Fathers, and Husbands, *have no manner of domestick Jurisdiction, but by and under the King's Majesty, as the only supreme Head of all Families, to whom by Holy Scripture Power and Authority is given to hear and determine all manner of domestick Causes; and that all Authority of Paternal, and Conjugal Jurisdiction, is drawn and deducted from the King; and if they please, they may also forbid Fathers, and Husbands, to exercise all or any part of their Paternal or Conjugal Au-*

N 2

thority,

clxxx     *A Prefatory Discourse*

thority, without a Licence from the King: And upon supposition of such Laws, I would fain know of our Author, whether in his own way of arguing it would follow, that Parents had no antecedent Divine Authority over their Children, nor Husbands any antecedent Authority over their Wives, nor either of them any Power from God of Legislation, or Jurisdiction in their Families prior to these Laws.

Upon supposition of such new Laws, let me farther observe, that our Author might come upon all Families with his formidable 'IF's, and say, *if the Parliament invested the King, &c. if Fathers, and Husbands, have no domestick Jurisdiction independent of the King, &c. if after what hath been said, Parents, and Husbands, have an independent Power, &c.* And yet supposing such Laws, with such Preambles, and also Penn'd with such a Style, both Parents, and Husbands, would nevertheless still have their several Powers from God. The Parliament, when it pleases, may make Penal Laws to forbid Fathers, not to mention other things, to read the Scriptures, or pray in their Families, or catechise their Children; and the Clergy not to pray, or preach, or catechise, or baptize, or administer the Holy Eucharist publickly, without the King's express Commission under the *Broad Seal*: But would it follow from thence, that the *Paternal*, or *Sacerdotal* Power, or Duty, to do those things, commenced with those Laws, or that they had no antecedent Authority from God to do them before those Penal Laws were made? Those restraining Laws therefore, which our Author hath so pompously cited to prove, that Bishops have no Power of Legislation or Jurisdiction, but *mediately* from the Parliament, and *immediately* from the King, only prove that, under pain of such and



*in Answer to The Rights, &c. clxxxi*

such severe and terrible Penalties, they cannot, without the King's Leave and Licence first obtained, exercise the Power and Authority they have originally from God, or exert it in other manner, or upon other Persons, than the Laws have appointed: And the Church's Obedience, and Submission to such Laws (I do not say with my Author above cited, *till some better Times deliver us from them*) is no Argument against the Divine Original of her Power, which she derived from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. This shews the Fallacy of one of his killing IF's in his ' Preface, which is this: *If those Bishops* (saith he) *who happen to be authorized by the King to consecrate any other Bishops.* Where authorizing hath a *double entendre*; for it may signify either giving the original Power of Consecration to those Bishops, or the Power to exercise that original Power of consecrating, which they had from God before, and which their Predecessors exercised freely from the time of the Apostles, till the times those Laws were made, without such Restraints. In the former sense, by which he designed to deceive his Reader, his *If*, or hypothetical Antecedent is false, and so then must his Consequent be. For our Bishops, as all other Bishops, who live now, or formerly liv'd where there are no such Civil Laws, derive their Power of consecrating from God, tho' in our Nation they happen to be so restrained, and limited in the Exercise of it; and to prove this I need say no more, than that if it were otherwise, as our Author vainly endeavours to prove, the King might then indeed authorize any *Layman*, or *Civil Magistrate*, to consecrate Bishops, which is not only false, but impious for any Christian to assert. The World (praised be God) is not yet arrived to his degree of Impudence,

clxxxii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

and Profaneness, as to believe, or assert, that the King by his Commission may make Bishops, as he " doth *Judges, or other Civil Officers*; and I doubt not but her *Majesty*, and all her Judges, both of the Common and Civil Law, will detest this impious Notion, when they hear of it, and think his perverting, and wresting the Laws of the Land, to such an evil design and purpose, to be a Crime of a Civil nature, as well as a Sin against God. He was sensible the Scriptures were not reconcileable to his Deduction of the Bishop's Authority and Jurisdiction from the Magistrate, and therefore saith, "*nor can this be evaded by saying the Scripture requires Obedience to Bishops, for so it doth to Judges, and other Civil Officers; and yet none can have a Right to make them, except he who is a Legislator himself; or acts by his Authority.* But the Scripture requires Obedience to Bishops, as to *God's Ministers*, and Magistrates, as to those *who watch for our Souls*, the Souls of Kings as well as other Men, for which they must *give an account to God*; as to the *Ministers of Christ*, and *Stewards of his House*, which is the Church, to whose Spiritual Authority Kings and Senators, when they become Members of it, are to submit, as well as other Men. I have given him Examples of many godly and great Princes, who upon Principle so submitted to them, as their Spiritual Superiors, and who were Men of sound Understandings, and as free from Superstition and Bigotry, as from Profaneness, and who had too great Souls to submit to any Power, but what they believed was set over them by God.

What I have here said shews the Vanity of his \* Argument, by which he would prove, that the Bishops in consecrating other Bishops act *ministerially by virtue of the Royal Authority*; for they act as their Predecessors did in all Christian Countries before

---

\* Pref. p. xxix.

¶ Ibid.

\* Pref. p. xxxiv.

such Laws were made, as *God's Ministers*, who have Power from him to consecrate other Bishops; which Power, as to Circumstantial, and particularly as to Persons, they exercise and bring into act, as the Magistrate by Law appoints; but if the Magistrate either refuses to have any more Bishops consecrated, or will have them consecrate none but unqualified, or unworthy Persons, in such sad cases they owe no Obedience to him, or other Submission to his Laws, than with exemplary Patience, and Meekness, to undergo the Penalties; and in such Ruptures, and Persecutions, it is their Duty to exercise that Original Power they derived from God prior to all Human Laws, and trusting in him to provide, as well as they can, for the Being, and Preservation of the Church. Against this Original Power of Bishops to make Bishops <sup>v</sup> he saith: *But if the Bishops had Power from God to make Bishops, nothing could be more sacrilegious, than for a Prince to command his Ecclesiastical Sovereigns, on the greatest Penalty except Death, in a matter on which the whole Government of the Church depends.* The antecedent of this Argument, that Bishops have such a Power from God, is certainly true, and so owned to be by our Laws, which confirm the *Form, and Manner of ordaining, and consecrating, &c.* But the consequent, which reflects on our Princes, and their restraining Penal Laws as *sacrilegious*, is his own Inference, and he must look to that. For he takes the liberty, in his Book, to treat the *Magistrate* in a very rude, and sawcy manner, telling him, that he receives his Power, and Authority *in trust* from the People, and that he is their Servant and Minister, and accountable to them, contrary, I am sure, to the Style, and Intendment of our Laws; and I cannot guess at his Meaning in it, which cannot be good, unless it

clxxxiv      *A Prefatory Discourse*

be to stir up our *Sovereign Lord the People* to levy a Standing Army, that is, to keep themselves always ready armed to defend themselves, and their *Natural Rights* against their Ministers, or to provoke their Ministers to keep up Standing Armies to restrain, and overaw them. This they must do, if they permit their People to be corrupted with this rebellious Doctrine, which makes them hold their Crowns, and their Lives too, by the basest and most precarious of Tenures, the Pleasure of the People. But to return to his Argument, I will retort it in form upon himself, and in his own Words: *If the Bishops have Power from God to make Bishops, nothing can be more sacrilegious and offensive to God, than to write a Book, as he hath done, with the Malice, and Calumny of a Devil, against that Power, and against the Bishops, as if they had assumed it to themselves.* Either all the Bishops since the Time of the Apostles have been guilty of Sacrilege, or this Impeacher of them, and their Sacred Power, is highly guilty of it; and let God and Men judge, which of the two it is.

After writing against the Clergy, and their Spiritual Independent Power, with all the Contempt and Malice, that Man could write; after endeavouring to prove, by many Sophisms, that they are no better than the Peoples Servants, whom they may dismiss at pleasure, and that the <sup>2</sup> *Clergy have not so much Power as every petty Corporation*, who can make By-Laws for themselves without the Consent of our Kings; in a word, after misrepresenting them without distinction as Enslavers of Mankind, and the vilest of Men, he demurely wipes his foul Mouth at last, and saith, *Good Man*, he did all this <sup>2</sup> *to defend the Church of England against Papiſts, Jacobites, and other Highflyers, who caused him to engage in this Controversy, and professeth that none can have a juster Esteem for all her Clergy, who according*



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* clxxxv

*to the Doctrine of the best constituted Church, disown all Independency; by which, according to the Principles of his Book, he must mean disowning all Independency upon the People, as well as the Prince; and I am at a loss to know where the Church disowns all Independency on the one, or the other, I know no such Declaration she hath made. And then as for those who do not disown all Independency, after all his ridiculous outrageous Abuses of them, and their truly Christian Principles, which oblige 'em to think the Church to be a Society different from the State, and independent of it, he is all of a sudden full of Kindness to them: <sup>b</sup> As for them, saith he, who do not disown all Independency, I cannot do 'em a greater Kindness, than to shew them the pernicious Consequences of their Error, and how it necessarily makes all, who are governed by it, guilty of the most villainous Practices. Vain Man! who thinks to wheedle us after so much Rudeness, and inhuman and unchristian Usage; who hath charged us with an Error, which with all his Subtleties he cannot prove to be such, with a pretended Error, which is a Christian Truth, and must shew it self to be such in all times of violent Persecution, and which he not only precariously, but falsely, and impudently saith, makes all those who believe it, guilty of most villainous practices; he means, as it appears by his <sup>c</sup> absurd, and impertinent Citations, against the Civil Power. The first of them is taken out of my Lord Chancellor Clarendon's <sup>d</sup> Animadversions on Cressy's Fanaticism, in defence of Dr. Stillingfleet; and it is not against the Spiritual Power of the Church, as a Society distinct from the State, but against the unreasonable, and mischievous Abuse of it in the Church of Rome, which exempts the Things, and Persons of Clergy-men, from the Civil Justice of the Kingdom, and the Cogni-*

<sup>b</sup> P. 303.

<sup>c</sup> P. 304, 305, 306, 307, 308.

<sup>d</sup> P. 130, 131, 132.

clxxxvi    *A Prefatory Discourse*

sance of the Civil Tribunals; even, as he observes, in *cases of Treason*, setting up another Sovereign Power, another Tribunal and Jurisdiction, to which Criminal Clergymen may appeal from the Civil Power and Tribunals; a Doctrine not practised, or thought of among the Christians of the pure ancient Churches, who yet believed the Church to be a Society of Christ's Erection, distinct from the Empire, and independent of it, and which the Church of *England* expressly disowns, and her Clergy ever since the Reformation have strenuously impugned in their Writings, nay which many Divines of the Church of *Rome* it self have written against, in defence of the Civil Power. The next long Transcript out of Dr. *Barrow* of the Pope's Supremacy, is entirely against the Pope's Supremacy, and <sup>e</sup> immense Power, who, as the Doctor observes, allows Men to tell him to his Face, that *all Power in Heaven and Earth is given unto him*. Such a Power it is against which he writes, as the Popes usurp over the Church, as well as the State, a boundless and truly tyrannical Power, which cannot but *interfere*, and *clash* with the Peace of the one, as well as the other, and is equally destructive to the Rights of both. An uncontrollable Power, as Christ's pretended only Vicar, which would bring all Churches, and their Bishops, as well as all Kingdoms, and their Kings, under one Head. A monstrous Power, under which Churches as well as Kingdoms groan, which swallows, and devours the Spiritual, as well as the Temporal Power, exempting great numbers of Persons from Subjection to both, and withdrawing Causes from both Jurisdictions. It is against this Power equally destructive to both, that the Doctor wrote; a Power, as he also observes, that exempts Subjects from the Authority and Jurisdiction of their Kings, and makes Kings the Popes Lieutenants, Vassals, and Feudatories, and also utterly de-

*in Answer to The Rights, &c. clxxxvii*

It roys the ancient Aristocratical, and Collegiate Government of the *Cath.* Church. But tho' there is so vast a difference between the true *independent Power* of the Church, and the false *independent Power* of the Pope; yet to deceive unwary, and gratify willing Readers, the Doctor, who wrote against the Pope's Supremacy, must be knavishly cited by him for the sake of *INDEPENDENT POWER*. But he knows very well the different Sense of *INDEPENDENT*, with respect to these two Powers. For when we speak of the *independent Power* of the Church, we only mean that it hath a Power and Policy of its own, different from that of the Empire, upon which it must subsist in all Countries, be it united with, or disunited from the *Commonwealth*, be it in a state of Peace and Union, or of Persecution and Rupture, from the Civil Government; and that this independent Power of the Church is not a *co-ordinate Power*, and *repugnant* to the Empire, but subordinate to it, the Church being a Society which gives to *Cesar* all the things that are *Cesar's*, which subjects her People and Priests to his Authority, be he Believer or Unbeliever, Friend or Foe, Protector or Persecutor; and which exempts none of her Society from his Obedience, or Tribunals, or pretends to depose him, or dispose of his Dominions, tho' he turn Apostate, Heretick, or Tyrant; or to lift up any Hand against him, except in Prayer to Heaven; but on the contrary she teaches her People to suffer evil from him patiently: And let me tell him, that this pure, holy, and peaceable Doctrine of not resisting the Magistrate, is that which keeps the Church from thwarting the State, or clashing with it, even when it clashes with the Church, much more from putting it into that condition of *Distraction* and *Confusion*, as Dr. Barrow shews from History, as well as Reason, the *Papal Power* doth.

---

[ See Dr. Parker's excellent Book of Religion and Loyalty, Part 1. §. 5.

## clxxxviii *A Prefatory Discourse*

To as little purpose he cites *Gomarus*, and *Guatierus* about the Papal Supremacy, and <sup>s</sup> Dr. *Scot* for saying, *that before the coming of Christ, the Authority of Princes, was bounded by no Law but that of Nature, and that the Christian Religion is so far from retrenching their Power, that it abundantly ratifies and confirms it.* Whereas the Doctor speaks of the Authority of Princes, only as to *Civil Matters*, in which Princes exercise their Authority, and in which Religion doth not retrench, but ratifies, and confirms their Power in such a manner, as is inconsistent with this Writer's ridiculous Origin of Civil Government, and his whole Scheme erected thereupon.

From hence it is evident how knavish as well as impertinent, and malicious, our Author is in joining *Papists* with *Jacobites*, and other *High-flyers*, as he calls all true Churchmen, whose Principles he knows are as contrary to *Popery*, and the *Papal Power*, as Good is to Evil, or Light to Darkness. Thus a sly *Veteran Atheist*, or *Theist*, when he hath written against Christianity, and Christians, with all the Art and Spite he can, may after all the Harm and Dishonour he hath done Religion, ridiculously pretend, that he engaged in the Controversy only to defend it against Fanaticks, Enthusiasts, Bigots, and other superstitious *High-flyers*; but that none can have a juster Esteem for all Professors of Christianity, who disown Enthusiasm, Bigotry, and Superstition, and are not of that *strait-lac'd, narrow sort*, who confine the Church to their own Pale and Party; and as for them, who are not such, he cannot do them a greater Kindness, than to shew them the Consequences of the others Error; and then pick Passages out of any Author, who hath written against *Enthusiasm, Bigotry, and Superstition*, and shew'd the evil Practices of those who are guilty of them, as if they were the Consequences of true, pure, and primitive Christia-



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* clxxxix

nity; and that all Christians who were not *Latitudinarians*, i. e. of all true and strict Christians, who defend the ancient Faith, Rights, and Polity of the Church against all Innovations, were by their Principles in danger to be such.

So he may write another Book with like Artifice and Malice against the *honourable and most useful* Profession of the Law, and without distinction represent Lawyers as he hath done the Clergy, as the vilest of Men, and then think to come off with saying, he wrote only against *Chican*, and *Chicaneurs*: Or he might, if he would, write in the same manner against *Government*, particularly against *Monarchy*, which he doth not love, and without distinction represent all *Monarchs* in common, as Tyrants, Pests, and Grievances of Mankind, and then demurely pretend, that he only wrote against such *High-flying* Monarchs, or other pretended supreme Governors, who say they are the Ministers of God, and not of the People, to shew them the pernicious Consequences of their Error; but as for those who disown that Principle, and, according to the Doctrine of his Book, own themselves to be the *Ministers, Servants, and Trustees* of the People, to whom they are accountable, that none can have a juster Esteem for them than he.

But tho' in his Book he hath made Kings no better than the Servants of the People, yet inconsistently with himself, and his noble Scheme of Government, he magnifies their Supremacy in Spirituals, and would make them *Civil Popes* to the Church, who have Power to exempt her Subjects from their Spiritual Obedience and Subjection to her, to inflict all her Spiritual Censures, and execute all her Spiritual Offices, and in short to be the *Reverse of the Pope* to the Clergy, and plainly to be to the *Hierarchs* of the Church, as the Pope pretends to be to them. This *Papal-like* Power to devour and swallow up the Power of the Church, and destroy her Jurisdiction

and Tribunals, he gives to our Monarchs over the Church of *England*, especially in Parliament, which he will not allow them over any other Church, or Religious Society of his own making, in which the Peasant is equal in Authority to the Prince. But he is free and prodigal in giving our Princes as great Power, and as destructive over the National Church and her Clergy, as the Popes claim over *them*; and the true reason why he is so free to give what no Human Power on Earth can give them, is, that when this Civil *Demogorgon*, as he would make the Magistrate, had devoured the Church, his *Polyphemus* of the People, in virtue of their Natural Rights, might swallow up the Magistrate; and then our Princes and Priests would soon know by what Tenure they hold their *Crowns* and *Miters*, and the *Masters*, whom they had the Happiness and Honour to serve. But to return him the Civility and Kindness he professeth for the Clergy, after all his barbarous Usage of us, we have great reason not only to shew him, but to shew the Government the pernicious Consequences of his Error, in making our Kings and Queens, contrary to our Laws, the Servants and Trustees of the People; an Error fruitful of all Mischiefs, and fatal to Kingdoms, and Commonwealths, that hath made more Civil Wars, and shed a thousand times more Blood, than all the Tyrants in the Records of History; an Error from which the *Greeks* and *Romans* turned with detestation, as fast as they became Christians; an Error contrary to the Scripture-History of the Original of Mankind; a foolish and absurd, as well as a precarious Error, founded in nothing but an imaginary State of Nature, which never was, and never could be; in a word, an Error, which gives infinite Pretence to ambitious and crafty *Demagogues* in all Countries, to lead the People at all times into Rebellions, to their own Destruction, and to become Slaves to their pretended Deliverers, whose Little  
Fingers

Fingers are commonly heavier than their lawful Governour's Loins.

He hath not omitted one Statute in his Preface, from which he could take any the least Argument, to prove that the Clergy derive their Power of inflicting Spiritual Censures from the Laws of the Land. <sup>a</sup> He goes about to prove it from the Causes of *Wills* and *Marriages*; but doth it follow, because they derive the Cognisance of those Civil Causes from the Temporal Power, that therefore they derive their Power of inflicting Spiritual Censures from it, which they had and exercised before the Church had any Temporal Privileges granted to it, and would retain, tho' they were all taken away? To as little purpose he goes about to prove it from 2 and 3 of *Edw. VI.* which declares it lawful for every Judge Ecclesiastical, to excommunicate any Person, that would not obey his Sentence given in Causes of Tithes. But that is no more than to make it lawful for the Ecclesiastical Judge, by the Temporal Law, to execute the Power of Excommunication, which belonged to him before. He also proves it to as little purpose from 5 and 6 *Edward VI. c. 4.* which enacts, that if any Person shall by Words only quarrel, chide, or brawl in any Church, or Church-yard, it shall be lawful for the Ordinary to suspend a Layman so offending *ab ingressu Ecclesia*, and a Clergyman from *the Ministration of his Office*, as long as he shall think meet. To which I answer with Submission to better Judgments, that these are Spiritual Censures, which the Ordinary had a Right to inflict for the same Crime before this Act was made. As for Suspension of a Clergyman from the Ministration of his Office, every one knows it is a Spiritual and Canonical Censure; and as for Suspension of a *Layman* from *entering into the Church*, it was a Spiritual Punishment, which St. Am-

cxcii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

*brose* inflicted on *Theodosius* the Great, and he submitted to; and this Act therefore did not then first make it lawful for the Ordinary to inflict these Censures for that Crime, but oblige him to do it, which without the Law perhaps he might not have done. This Law therefore doth not suppose, as he suggests, that it was not lawful for the Ordinary to inflict these Censures for the same Crime before; but its Intention was to bind him to inflict them, and to encourage and assist him in so doing.

He also proves the Power of the Magistrate to inflict Spiritual Censures; from 3 *Jac.* I. c. 5. which enacts, *That every convict Popish Recusant shall stand, and be reputed and disabled as a Person lawfully and duly excommunicated, and as if he, or she, had been so denounced and excommunicated:* Where it is plain the Intendment of this Act is only to put convict Recusants in the condition of Excommunicates, as to Civil Penalties, Incapacities, and Disabilities. And this he seems to grant by saying, <sup>i</sup> *if this is not a full Proof*; but tho' he thought it not a full, or I believe a good proof, yet he would make use of it, because it might take with undiscerning Readers, especially with such as are no Friends to the Spiritual Authority of the Church.

From this he proceeds to a <sup>k</sup> *certain Proof* from paragraph 11 of 5 and 6 *Edw.* VI. c. 4. which enacts, *that if any Person shall smite, or lay violent hands upon any other in Church, or Church-yard, then ipso facto he shall be deemed Excommunicate, and be excluded from the Fellowship of Christ's Congregation, and that every Person, who maliciously strikes any Person with any Weapon in Church, or Church-yard, or shall draw any Weapon in Church, or Church-yard, with an intent to strike another, shall be, and stand, ipso facto, excommunicated.* To which, under correction of the Learned in the Civil and Canon Laws, I answer, that this Act

<sup>i</sup> Pref. p. xxvii.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid.



is no certain Proof, or strictly speaking any Proof at all, of the Magistrate's Power to inflict Spiritual Censures, because the Sentence of the Ecclesiastical Judge is necessary before this Excommunication by the Law can have any Spiritual Effect upon the Criminal, tho' the Crime, or Fact, properly speaking, were *notorious*, or such as needed no Proof. This I say in reply to our Author, who affirms, that the Sentence of the Judge Ecclesiastical is only thought necessary, that the Offender might judicially appear to have been guilty of the Fact; but I humbly conceive it must also be necessary to exclude the Offender from the *Fellowship and Company of Christ's Church*, which no Temporal Power without the Spiritual can do. For if the Temporal Power of it self could validly, and with spiritual effect, exclude from the Fellowship, and Communion of Christ's Church, then its Excommunications would have the same effect in all other Churches, as well as in those of its own Dominions, and its Excommunicates would be Excommunicates all the Christian World over, and so a Man standing excommunicated in *England* merely by Lay-power, would have no Right to communicate in any other part of the Catholick Church. But this I presume none but our Author, or such as he, will be so hardy as to affirm; and therefore till I am better inform'd, I will make no difficulty to say, that when the Law doth annex the Penalty of Excommunication to a Crime or Fact, the Sentence of the Spiritual Judge is necessary, not only to make the Truth thereof appear (for that any Temporal Judge might do) but to the *Excommunication it self*, to bring the act to its actual and last effect, or what perhaps will please our Author better, to the *very Execution of the Act*: For as *High-Church* and *High-flyer* as he may call me, or think me to be, I think, in such cases as this before us, where the Magistrate enacts, that a Man guilty of a Crime, that deserves Ex-

communication, shall be excluded from the Fellowship of Christ's Church, that the Spiritual ought to be the Executioner of the Temporal Power, and to be aiding and assisting thereunto. I say, in all such cases, where the Magistrate enacts, that any Person guilty of a Crime, which deserves Excommunication, because if Excommunication were enacted as a Punishment for smaller Crimes, which in no wise deserved it, there the Spiritual Power is not to obey the Magistrate. As for example, if an Act of Parliament were made to excommunicate any Person, who happened to fall asleep in the Church, the Spiritual Judges ought rather to suffer any Penalty, than to pronounce the Sentence of Excommunication for such an Offence, that was no more than a common human Infirmary, for which the Offender could not deserve to be excluded from the Communion of Saints, from the Fellowship of the Catholick Church. Such a solemn Abuse and Profanation of the Power of the Keys would it self deserve Excommunication; and therefore the Spiritual Magistrate, whose Duty I own it to be obedient to the Temporal in all lawful things, ought rather, with Christian Patience and Submission, to undergo any Punishment, than to do so wicked and unlawful a thing.

He argues against the Sacerdotal Office and Order, as he thinks, in a very Popular, I am sure in a very *Mobish* manner, as if it had nothing peculiar, and proper to it, which is unlawful for others to do. If the Office of a Clergyman (saith he) was so appropriated, that it was unlawful for others to meddle with it, they ought not to visit the Sick, reconcile Differences, or instruct one another in those Duties they owe to God and each other. — Every Christian is obliged to reprove, rebuke, admonish, exhort, and warn one another. — And that some have more convenience for doing this

than others, depends upon the Peoples allowing them a sufficient Maintenance wholly to attend that End. Very right, Sir; for, as it is commonly said, it is likewise very true, that *what is every body's is no body's Work*; and therefore in his Scheme of a Church two things, it seems, are convenient, and fit to be done; *First*, that some Men should be appointed on purpose wholly to attend on these holy Offices; and *secondly*, that they should have a sufficient Maintenance allowed them upon that account. Here then it is lawful for the People, tho' not for God, nor the Prince, to annex Profits, and tack Revenues, and Preferments to the Ministers, or Officers of holy things. But this in other places was to <sup>m</sup> discourage impartial Examination, to make Men Hypocrites, and Dissemblers with God, <sup>n</sup> to give the Magistrate a Power over Mens Properties, to encourage Men to profess such speculative Opinions, as they do not believe, and invent a thousand sophistical, and knavish Methods (which none understands better than himself) to defend them to the infinite Prejudice of Truth. <sup>o</sup> It is the occasion of extinguishing Humanity among Christians, of dividing them into several Sects, and <sup>p</sup> makes the Clergy in all Countries the Magistrate's Deputies, and generally speaking, of the Religion to which they find Preferments annexed. These are the evil Influences, and Effects of Maintenance and Revenues, to support the Ministers of Christ; but Contributions and Salaries, tho' never so great, with Houses never so good, would have no such Effects on the Ministers of the People in any Church of their Erection. If a Congregation consisting of a thousand rich *Arians*, *Socinians*, or other *Unitarians*, should according to his Scheme chuse our Author for their Minister, then, Good Man, nothing would be too much, or too great for him. Four or Five hundred per Annum

<sup>a</sup> P. 17.

<sup>a</sup> P. 22.

<sup>o</sup> P. 23.

<sup>p</sup> P. 25.

would not *discourage him from impartial Examination*; nay, were the whole Nation *Arians*, and the People had as many Ministers of their own making and choice, as the Church hath Canonical Ministers now, their Maintenance and Revenues, which generally speaking would be much better, than that of the Clergy, would in no degree influence their pure Minds, or incline them to be of that Religion, which in all its Congregations had such comfortable Maintenance for its Ministers of the *Peoples choice*. But to let this pass, is it necessary for the People, in his Notion of Churches, to appoint some to minister in holy things; and may not God appoint an Order of Men for the same purpose in the Holy Catholick Church? Are there <sup>9</sup> some Holy Things, some Religious Duties, as he is forced to acknowledge, that cannot *conveniently be left in common, but for Order sake* must be committed to the Care of some particular Persons, who are wholly to attend them; and may not God *set apart* a perpetual Order and Succession of publick Officers and Ministers in his Church for ever to attend those things, with peculiar Power, and Authority under Christ to teach them, as *Doctors* or Preachers; to govern them, as *Rulers*; and to bless them, as *Priests*? Whether he hath done so, or no, is, as I must still observe, a *Question of Fact*, which must be determined by the Practice of the Apostles, and the universal Practice of the Church in all places since the time of the Apostles, which is the best Commentary upon their Practice: And I will yet presume, that the ancient Histories of the Church, and Writings of the eldest Fathers, many of which I have produced in the following Letters, as evidence for the Divine Institution of the Christian Priesthood, are much better Testimonies for it, than all that our Author hath said, or



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* lxcvii

by the help of all the Deistical or Atheistical Clubs in the Town, can say against it. Well! but *every Man can do what a Clergy-man doth*, but can he do it with Sacerdotal Authority? Can he do it as a *Liturg*, as a publick Officer and Minister of *Jesus Christ*? And it is *every Man's Duty to do what he can to save another's Soul*: But can he do it in a Sacerdotal Ministerial manner, as an Officer to whom God hath committed the Charge of Souls, as a Shepherd of the Flock over which Christ hath made him an Overseer, as a Watchman for Souls, as a Minister of the New Testament, and as an Ambassador from God to Men? So he saith, *It is every Christian Man's Duty to reprove, rebuke, admonish, exhort*: But how? to rebuke sharply with all Authority, to reprove, and rebuke as a Superior, to admonish as one that hath the Rule over others in the Lord, and after due Admonition to censure; to give things in charge, as a Governour; to receive Accusations before Witnesses, as one who was to be answerable to Him in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks, who hath the sharp Sword with two Edges, for Male-administration; as an Angel of a Church, as his Servant, and Trustee, for *suffering the Woman Jezabel*, and *tolerating the Doctrines of Balaam*, and the *Nicolaitans*, and not turning the Teachers of them out of the Church. But still every Man can do what a Clergy-man doth, and it is *every Man's Duty to do what he can to save another's Soul*; and may not every Woman do what a Clergy-man doth? And do not the Texts he<sup>r</sup> cites to no purpose against the Sacerdotal Orders, relate to *Women* as well as to *Men*, to the *Sisters* as well as the *Brethren* of the Church. This he cannot but acknowledge, unless he will contradict his *Ulpian*, upon whose Authority the *Civil Law* saith, *Verbum hoc SIQVIS tam Masculos,*

cxcviii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

*quam Fœminas complectitur.* I would also fain know of our Author what things a *Jewish* Priest was to do, which every Man or Woman could not do as well as he? and if it was not every *Jew's* Duty, Man or Woman, to save another *Jew's* Soul? And I pray my Reader to consider, if this way of arguing against the Clergy is not the very same, or very like to that of 'Corah and Dathan against Moses and Aaron, to whom they said, *Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the Congregation are holy every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift you up your selves above the Congregation of the Lord.* You lift up your selves, said they, above the People of the Lord, and so saith our Author of the Clergy, that they assume to themselves a Power, an arbitrary Power over the People, and put themselves in God's place; just indeed as Moses and Aaron did, who did not put themselves in God's place, because God put them in his. Indeed this *Anabaptistical* and *Quaker*-way of arguing is of as much force against Moses, as against Aaron, against all Orders of Men in the State, as well as in the Church, that is, it is of no force at all: For what cannot other Men do as well as the King, or his Judges, or Justices of Peace? But can they do it legally, can they do it validly, or *cum juris effectu*, with effect in Law? What cannot other Citizens do as well as my Lord Mayor? But can they do it with the same Authority? And is it not every Man and Woman's Duty to keep the Peace of the Kingdom, and of the City where he dwells? But is it their Duty to keep it as publick Officers, and legal Guardians of the Peace? Thus Men of our Author's implacable Hatred to Priesthood matter not how they argue, or what they say, so it be against the Order, or Succession, or Revenues of the Clergy, or what Confusion they bring upon the World, if they can but confound Priests.

---

† See Dr. Fearly's *Dipper dipt*, sixth Edit. 1651, Article iv.

The Doctrine of the Churches being a *Society* of God's Institution, or the external visible Kingdom of Christ upon Earth, being, for want of due Instruction, not so well understood by all Christians in these, as in ancient times, gives her Enemies great Advantages of deceiving the People by such like false Reasonings as these, which in former Ages would have made no Impression upon Christian People; and whether the Church is not such a Society, which hath its publick Officers and Ministers appropriated to teach and govern their Flocks, and who have Power from God to censure and turn out, is, as I have had occasion to say often, a *Question of Fact*, of which I hope I have given sufficient evidence in the following Books. But before I finish my Answer to this Argument, I cannot but observe, that in one place he limits his general Expressions, saying, that ' *Most things, which the Clergy are obliged to perform, are every Man's Duty.* If every Man therefore can do but *most* things the Clergy can do. then there are some things so appropriated to their Office, that other Men may not do; and I would fain know of him what they are; for in other places he excepts none, no not administering the Holy Eucharist, as in p. 104, and 108. where, without any Reverence for God, or the Practice of the Church, he calls the *Consecration of the Elements* CONJURATION, which is a *Derogation*, and *Depraving* of the Holy Office in the most profane manner, and in the highest degree: But bold and blasphemous Speeches of this nature are very common with him: they are the Ornaments, as well as the Arguments of his Book.

As for the *Consecration of Bishops*, and *Ordination of Priests*, for want of Arguments, he ridicules and

## A Prefatory Discourse

"blasphemes them with all his might. *I would fain know of these Gentlemen (saith he) what they mean by giving the Holy Ghost; his Person I presume they will not pretend to dispose of.* This is a leud Sarcasim, and a most profane and insolent Mocking of the Bishops, and their Holy Order, and needs no other Observation. *And then (saith he) they can only mean his Gifts.* Most certainly the Gifts, which by a Metonymy in Scripture are often called *the Spirit*, and which in Consecration and Ordination they give to the Persons consecrated and ordained: But how? not in their own Name, but as *Peter gave Soundness to the Lame Man, when he said, Silver and Gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee, in the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.* They give them by solemn \* Prayer, and Imposition of Hands, in his Name, as the Apostles did, particularly *St. Paul to Timothy, to whom he said, Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery; and I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my Hands.* This Ceremony of laying Hands upon Persons, to confer Power upon them as Successors, or Assistants, was continued from the *literal* to the *mystical* Judaism, which is the universal Church of God. There are many Instances of it joined with solemn Prayer, in the Texts cited in the Margin: And as then in Baptism God together with the Ordinary gave very often the extraordinary, and miraculous Gifts of the Spirit, but after Miracles ceased only the ordinary Gifts: So in the Ordination of Persons unto Ecclesiastical Offices, he commonly gave them both Gifts, while he continued Miracles in the Church; but afterwards only

---

\* P. 74, 75, 76, 77.    \* Acts vi. 6. viii. 15, 17. xiii. 2, 3.  
 1 Tim. iv. 14.    2 Tim. ii. 7.    1 Tim. v. 22.



the ordinary Gifts, particularly those which were requisite for their Order, with Sanctity of Life, and Gravity of Conversation, according to the Prayers of the Congregation; and if at any time the Person consecrated or ordained received not those Gifts, or after he receiv'd them, lost them, it was, as in Baptism, through some hindrance, or default in himself, which *quenched the Spirit*, and therefore it was a trifling Argument against conferring the Gifts of the Holy Spirit to say, \* *if the Bishops can bestow the ordinary Gifts, as Meekness, Patience, &c. no Clergy-man could be without them.* This way of arguing makes Baptism a solemn Mockery, as he saith Ordination is, destroys all Baptismal Grace, and Gifts, as well as those of Ordination, and utterly evacuates all the Promises of Divine Grace, and Assistances of the Divine Spirit; and putting *Baptism* instead of *Ordination*, I desire any sober Reader to tell me, if the following Passage of the same tenor with the precedent, is not a profanation of the one as well as the other; † *What share soever the Clergy might have of the Holy Spirit before Ordination, they then are possess'd of no other Spirit than that of Pride, Ambition, Covetousness, Uncharitableness, Imposition, Malice, Revenge, Persecution, &c.* Indeed he here names the *Popish Clergy*; but any Man may see he means the Clergy in general, and particularly those of the Church of *England*, of whom he spake in the former Passage, and whom ‡ in another place he accuses without distinction of *Pride and Haughtiness*; and now might not a *Jew* say after his example, what share soever the Christians have of the Holy Spirit before Baptism, they then are possess'd of no other Spirit than that of *Pride, &c.* and would it be any Excuse for his Malice to say *Popish Christians*, to wound all Christians through the *Popish Christians Sides*. It is also plain

\* P. 76.

† P. 77.

‡ P. 131.

he means all Ordainers, and Ordained in the following words: *This is no wonder, when in so serious a Concern, as making of Bishops and Priests, both the Ordained and Ordainers in that Church act with a solemn Mockery, one in pretending a Call from, and the other in giving the Holy Ghost.* But why in that Church? Are not the Ordained and Ordainers guilty of the same solemn Mockery in the Church of England, as her Ordinals<sup>a</sup> shew, and he knew very well. Nevertheless he hath Confidence, to add, he thinks with great Art, this Irony: *As this by no means ought to be objected to the Clergy of the Church of England:* But then Nature overcomes Art in the next words: *So here that which some of them act at the Election of a Bishop, is no manner of kin to this holy Farce of the Papists in imploring the direction of the Holy Ghost to chuse a fit Person, tho' they are resolved beforehand to proceed according to the direction of the Conge d'elire (he means the Letter Monitory) and name only him, whom they are bound to take by that Writ.* I know not whom this can concern but Deans and Chapters, to whom the Conge d'elire with the Letter Monitory is directed; but I never heard, that before, or at the Election, they meet together to implore the Direction of the Holy Ghost to chuse a fit Person. I never heard of any such Office in the Church of England for the Election of Bishops: But however many of his Readers will believe it, and that is as much for his purpose, as if it were true. He hath other spiteful oblique Reflections on the Clergy in general, couched under the Phrase of Popish Clergy, as where he saith, *I cannot but observe, that the Popish Clergy make very bold with the Three Persons of the H. Trinity. The first they employ as their Executioner, to put their*

---

<sup>a</sup> Do you think in your heart you be truly called, &c? And are you persuaded that you be truly called to this Ministration &c?

<sup>b</sup> P. 75.

*Judicial Sentences in force.* I have already made some Observations on this malicious and sophistical turn of Speech upon the Clergy, which reflects on the Apostles, and all their Successors to this day, as well as on the Popish Clergy, who, as in many other Instances they teach the true ancient Doctrines of Christianity, so as to *Censures* they maintain, that God is pleased to bind in Heaven, whom his Servants by his own Authority bind on Earth; and in this Ratification of the Sentence of Excommunication by God, according to his own Ordinance, he scurrilously saith the Clergy imploy him, as *their Executioner*. Had this Man lived in the Days of *Moses*, would he not have said, that he employ'd God as his Executioner to destroy the *Egyptians*, and the Company of *Corah*? And may he not as well say, that *Azariah* the Priest made God his Executioner to smite King *Uzziah* with the Leprosy, for attempting to burn Incense unto the Lord? Why doth he not say, that St. *Peter* employ'd God as his Executioner on *Ananias* and *Sapphira*? Or that St. *Paul* imploy'd *Satan* as his Executioner upon the incestuous *Corinthian*, for he is capable of saying any thing, who hath the assurance to say, that *the Clergy make God their Executioner*, that they put themselves in his place, and assume a Divine Power to themselves. Why doth he not say in the same Atheistical way of speaking, that they assume to themselves a Power to punish Men eternally, that they make him their Executioner of everlasting Damnation, and to this end have appointed him a Day, in which he must judge the World for them; and when he hath done that for them, then they'll imploy him and his Angels as the Executioners of that everlasting Punishment, which they take upon them in his Name to denounce against Sinners. At this profane way of talking, he may tax the Christians of Pride and Presumption, as *Cacilius* doth *Minutius Felix*, for making

God the Destroyer of the Machine of the World, and their Executioner of the last Conflagration, in which the Sun and Stars, *saith he*, as they arrogantly talk, must be consumed, and yet they themselves forsooth must be immortal, and live in everlasting Joy. Nay in this blasphemous Figure of Speech, of which I now take leave, he may *mock* on, and say, that Christians confine God's Presence to their Assemblies, and immure him up in a *Heathenish manner* in their Temples, where they tie his Ears to their Prayers, and command him by the Mouths of his Priests to grant whatsoever they ask, to execute whatsoever they desire, especially if they desire it in a certain Name. 'Tis the *Devil*, that inspires him with Rhetorical Figures of this sort; and I doubt not but we shall find stores of them in his *Second Part*, in which he will bless the World with a farther Discovery of *Priestcraft*, unless these Remarks happen to make him more sparing and cautious, and then that Book will want a great part of the *Logick*, as well as *Rhetorick*, that this Book hath, and by consequence be more flat, and dull.

From the first he goes on to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, which without *Justess* of Speech, or *Justice* to their most absurd Doctrine, he saith the Popish Priests *make out of a bit of Bread*; but that, God be praised, concerns not our Priests, whom I have reason to think he hates more than those of the *Roman Church*. Then as to the Third Person, saith he, *they freely dispose of him, at least of his Gifts, to all they lay hands on*, meaning in Ordination. But may he not, as I have observed before, speak in the same manner of Baptism, and with the same Impudence lampoon this, as he hath done that. But then, saith he, *there are some who say, that if the Popish Priests have any Spirit bestowed upon them at their going into Orders, 'tis that of the Priest of Apollo, when full of the God he cried,*

Jam



Jam furor humanum nostro de pectore sensum  
Expulit, & totum spirant præcordia Phœbum.

The *Some* he really means are such as himself, and his Club, one of whom <sup>c</sup> said, *He would as soon send for his Coachman to administer the Sacrament to him, as an Archbishop.* And by *Popish Priests* I must say again, he means all Christian Priests; and had he not himself been full of *Apollo*, or some other *Damon*, who formerly deceived the World, he could not have uttered such things, as he hath written against *Christian Priests*. The *Pythones*, in the *Acts* treated *St. Paul* and *Silas* in another manner; for the believing and trembling Spirit in her forced her to confess, that they were *the Servants of the most High God*; but the Spirit of Uabelief, which possesses him, makes him deny that their Successors are *his Servants*, or the Ministers of Christ; but on the contrary it inspires them with boldness to say, that their Ordination is a solemn Mockery, a holy Farce, in which they receive no other Spirit but the evil Spirit of Pride, &c. and that their Pretension to Priesthood is nothing but Priestcraft.

I pass over many other things, as <sup>d</sup> where, after *Mr. Hobbes*, he calls them *a set of Men*, <sup>e</sup> posted so in every Parish, that they can harangue the People in public twice a Week, that their Doctrine of an Independent Power (tho' not his) <sup>f</sup> ought to be suppressed, that the Belief of it is the Folly and Bigottry of Priest-ridden (and perhaps in time he'll say of Christ-ridden, or Apostle-ridden) Men. And then he doth them the honour to cite an Heathen Author against them, <sup>g</sup> as a sort of Flatterers, who do not worship God, but the Im-

<sup>c</sup> Preface to the Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, &c.

<sup>d</sup> P. 247.

<sup>e</sup> P. 244.

<sup>f</sup> P. 257.

<sup>g</sup> P. 260.

perial Purple; and whoever is a Christian of that *Anti-christian* sort, which delights in seeing Christian Priests, and their Power and Order, thus slandered and profaned, he may in his viii<sup>th</sup> Chapter *regale* his *Atheist* ridden, or *Theist*-ridden, or *Sceptick*-ridden may I not justly say, or *Devil*-ridden Mind.

His ix<sup>th</sup> Chapter is controversial upon two Points, which do not directly concern the Independency of the Church. The first concerns the Divine Institution of Bishops, and the second the uninterrupted Succession, both which, he saith, are attended with <sup>a</sup> numerous Absurdities. 'Tis the prevailing Opinion, saith he, that the Bishops are by Divine appointment Governors of the Christian Church, and that no one is capable of being of that number, who derives not his Right by an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the Catholick Church. I will now shew some of the numerous Absurdities of this Hypothesis.

But that Bishops are by Divine appointment; and derive their Right by uninterrupted Succession, is no Hypothesis, as he miscals it, but *Matter of Fact*, believed and practised for 1500 Years in the Christian Church. For the proof of this I might send him to <sup>i</sup> many Learned Writers; but, I hope, I have said what is sufficient to prove it in the following Letters, and in the beginning of this Preface. But let us see the Absurdities which, he saith, attend these plain Practices, which are not mere *Hypotheses*, as he would insinuate, but will appear to any Man, who reads the Ancients, to be positive Doctrines, most evident and constant Matters of Fact.

Well! let us see these grand Absurdities; and first of all those which, he saith, attend the Government of the Church by Bishops, *First*, saith he, *if making of Laws, and executing of them (without both*

<sup>a</sup> P. 313.

<sup>i</sup> Such as Spalatensis de Rep. Ecclesiastica. And Ep. Bilson's Perpetual Government of the Church.

which there can be no Government) be in the same Persons the Bishops, they will lie under a Temptation to make such, as more regard their own separate Interest than the Good of the Church. Is not this a doughty Argument against the Legislative, and Executive Power of Bishops, which militates against all Power, even against the Legislative, and Executive, where they are separate, as well as, where they are united, because they may tempt those who are vested with them to abuse them, and are in fact very often abused. This is his old *Popular Fallacy* in arguing a gainst Power from the Abuse of it; and I will make no difficulty to say, that it is of as much force against all Natural and Civil, as Ecclesiastical Power, nay even against all the Powers and Faculties of Body and Soul, that God hath given to Man. Nay, it confounds the very Power which he gives to the People, among whom the major part must determine as they think fit, they must have both the making and executing of Laws, and by his consequence will lie under a Temptation to make such, as regard the Interest of their own Party; for in all *Democracies* the greater number is but a *Party*, a prevailing Party against the less. Nay, if this Reasoning of his were true, the ancient Patriarchal Form of Government was absurd, because the Legislative and Executive Power was in the Heads of Tribes. Nay, it utterly overthrows the Paternal and Conjugal Government and Masterhip in Families, where the same Man having the Legislative and Executive Domestick Power, as Father, Husband, and Master, not only may, but, as daily Experience shews, too often doth abuse it in a most barbarous, not only unchristian, but inhuman manner. In the last place, this *Herouleian* Argument knocks down, as it were with a Club, all Civil Governments where the Legislative and Executive is in one single Person, or in one single *Aristocratical Senate*, which have  
the

the making and executing of their own Laws; and if our Author would go to *Venice*, and use this Argument against that Government, I believe he would soon have such an Answer from the *Council of Ten*, as his tender Constitution would not like.

But he goes on, and having the *Executive Power*, they may abuse it without the least controul, there being no Appeal from them; nor can the People (which cannot happen in a Government founded by them) have any Right to redress themselves. I have already considered his Argument against the Bishops executive Power from this Inference, that they may through Human Frailty abuse it, and shew'd, that it proves so much, that it loses all its force against them, and plainly proves nothing at all. But in saying the People have no Appeal from them, he speaks, whether knowingly or no I will not determine, very falsely against Fact. For there neither is, nor ever was any Civil Government, which allows its People more or larger Appeals than the Ecclesiastical doth from the Sentences and Tribunals of their Bishops; but suppose it did not, is the Episcopal Power therefore *unlawful, absurd, intolerable*, because there lies no Appeal from it? If so, then all last Resorts and Appeals must be so too, even that which he pretends he would have the last Appeal to, the Tribunal of the People, which, let them write what they will, I dare say he and his Partisans, who count the Populace so much, despise and ridicule in their Hearts.

Then he proceeds: This being a Government so tyrannical in its Frame and Constitution, can we suppose the Divine Goodness would miraculously interfere to impose it on the Church for ever? Here first he uses the invidious Word *impose* for what God appointed and ordained: Secondly, he seems to suppose, that God imposed or appointed it for some time, tho' he cannot imagine he would impose it for ever; and I would



would fain know to what Period; or Number of Years he thinks the Divine Imposition of Episcopal Government was to last, or when it was to become indifferent, or to expire. *Thirdly*, he supposes the Divine Goodness did not, or could not appoint a Government of that Frame and Constitution *for ever*; tho' the Church always believed and received it as a standing perpetual Policy or Constitution; and to call this Divine Frame of Government absurd and tyrannical, is it self most *absurd*; and, as I have already observ'd, an Impeachment not only of the Goodness, but Wisdom of God.

The next Argument he brings against this Episcopal Form of Government hath been brought and answered many times: It consists in nothing but spiteful and invidious Clamour against the Divine Right of Episcopacy; for *weakening the Protestant Cause, for unchurching the Reformed Churches in other Countries, particularly that in Scotland*. To which I answer, *first*, that no strict Doctrines are to be rejected for the Severity of their Consequences upon Men; who will not believe them, or if they believe them, will not practise them, and who perhaps, because they are contrary to their Lusts, or their worldly Interests and Designs, are as contrary to them, and it may be hate them, and call them *dammning, destroying, and unnatural* Doctrines: But whatever hard or ugly Names our Men of *large Souls* may give strict Doctrines and Principles, they are nevertheless true; By such Names Libertines may, and do call the strict Christian Doctrines of Sobriety, Temperance, Chastity, Truth, Probity, Fidelity, Patience; especially that Doctrine of the Cross, *Passive Obedience*; and take upon them to make as it were new Gospels and Allowances for themselves, which Christ never made, saying, like our Author, *Can we suppose, can we believe*, that the Goodness of God would give us such Passions, and so strictly tie us up from the

Gra-

Gratification of them? Can we believe that infinite Wisdom, and infinite Goodness would make us of such a Frame, and damn us for doing so and so in such and such Circumstances? Can we believe that God expects the same Chastity from a Young Man, as from an Old? The same strictness of Life from a Soldier, as from a Divine? or that Princes must live like private Men? or that Men and their Families must be ruin'd, rather than break their Words, or Oaths? Away! away! These *Hypotheses* are inconsistent with the *Freedom of Human Nature*; we cannot suppose that infinite Goodness would bind us, in all Times, and all Places, to such strict unalterable Duties, as unman us in this World, or else damn us in the next.

Our Author's way of arguing against the Divine Right of Episcopal Government is altogether such as this: And therefore in the *second place*, as none of those Moral Doctrines, or those who preach them, can be said to *damn* the Transgressors, but the Transgressors, properly speaking, *damn* themselves; so it is not the Doctrine of the Divine Right of Episcopal Polity and Government, or those who preach it, and adhere to it, as necessary by Divine Institution, that *weakens the Protestant Cause*, or as others love to speak *widens the distance among Protestants*, and *unchurches the Presbyterian*, and other Churches that are not so much as Presbyterian; but as our Author truly speaks, it is they themselves who *unchurch themselves*, as a Society, by *throwing off a Government*; and let me add, by wilfully throwing off a Government, which was instituted by God for the perpetual unalterable Polity of the Church. They are the Men, who *truly* weaken the Protestant Cause in continuing a Church-Polity contrary to that, which Christ, and the Apostles erected for the Church in all *Places*, and *Ages*; who take upon them the Priesthood by a new Uncatholick Mission

of their own creating; and they *truly* and *properly* widen the distance among Protestants who reject the ancient Apostolical Mission, as needless, or unlawful, and perhaps besides a few Complements, which some of them have lately made to Episcopacy, and the Episcopal Mission, will not move one step towards us, but expect that we should go to them, and quit the ground upon which we so safely stand. I speak this with reluctance, tho with freedom and plainness, I call God to witness, not to reproach the Protestants of other Churches, who have *abdicated* Episcopacy, but in great Charity and Pity to them, beseeching them to consider, If indeed they can justify themselves to Christ, and the Christian World, for *abdicating* of it, and departing from the Constitution, and Mission of the Catholick Church. They all, except in *one place*, plead *necessity* for departing from it, and I would to God their Plea were good. But the *Necessities* they plead are Necessities of their own making, and continuing; chosen and wilful *Necessities*; and I am forced to say by consequence unjustifiable *Necessities*: *Necessities* out of which they may, and I think therefore ought to extricate and deliver themselves as soon as they can; in a word, *Necessities*, which in my Opinion would as well justify the Abdication of the Presbyterian Government, Ministry, and Mission, as the Episcopal; not only the Mission, and Ministry, which the Ministers of *some* Presbyterian Churches perhaps only derive from *\* Non-Presbyters*, or mere Lay-men, but also that which the Ministers of others of them derive from Presbyters Episcopally ordained. I beseech them both for *Christ Jesus* sake, the great Apostle, and High Priest of our Profession, and Bishop of our Souls, who established his Kingdom upon Earth in the Episcopal Government and Mission, to consider what they have done

in erecting up, and continuing another Government, another Mission, and another Ministry of their own devising, against the Government, and Ministry set up by Divine Authority for the Catholick Church, and to plead a *pretended Necessity* for so doing; a *Necessity*, which, I think, would as well justify the Abdication of the *Lord's-day*, or the *Use of the two Sacraments*, and which our Neighbours might as well plead, not only for the Abdication of *Episcopacy*, but of all publick Forms of Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, the Reading of the Word of God, and Confession of the Christian Faith, and the Lord's Prayer in Divine Worship. Let it no longer be said of them, that as they would not have Bishops, when they might, so now they will not have them, when they may. Let them not any longer give the common Adversary so great an Advantage against the Protestant Cause, by still asking them, as formerly at the Conferences of *Poissy* and *Fountainbleau*, and more lately by the Bishop of *Meaux*, *Where is your Mission?* Let them not longer continue to give so just an Offence to those, who, upon Catholick Principles and Practice, strictly adhere to the Episcopal Communion: Let them not put a longer stop to the Reformation by refusing to embrace the Divine Ordinance: Let them not longer hinder the Progress of it, or provoke God in Judgment to cast it out of Countries, where it is, because after so long Forbearance, they still delay to embrace that Form of Government, that Ministry, that Mission, and that *one Priesthood*, which He appointed for his Church. I speak this to all the Protestant Churches concerned as Christian Societies, to hear, and consider, what I say; and I speak it according as my Adversary would direct me to speak, to the whole Church in every place, to the *People*, as well as the *Ministers*, more especially to the Magistrates as the *Chiefs* of the People: I speak it from my



own Conscience to theirs, and I call God again to witness, that I speak it to them in the greatest Charity and Compassion, heartily bemoaning their Condition, and as heartily wishing I had not so just occasion given me to speak it: I speak it also with Zeal for their perfecting their Reformati<sup>o</sup>ns, and I hope with as true a Christian Zeal, as St. <sup>1</sup> Ignatius wrote unto the Christians of Smyrna, to whom he said, *Hearken unto the Bishops, that God may hearken unto you. My Soul shall be Security for theirs, who are subject to the Bishop with the Presbyters and Deacons, and may my Portion be with theirs in God.* With the same Assurance and Affection let me presume to speak to the Reformed Churches abroad, *Hearken unto Episcopacy, that God, who founded it in the Person and Office of his Son, and appointed it for the Government of his Kingdom, may hearken unto you.* Ἀντιψυχον εἶλω. Ἀντιψυχον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμά μου, *My Soul shall answer for yours, I will be your Security to God for submitting to Episcopacy; if you sin in so doing let my Soul answer to him for it, and when you return to it, then let my Soul be with yours, then let my Lot and Portion be together with yours in God.* I say when you return to it; for your Churches, which you have happily reformed in Doctrines, as all other Churches throughout the Christian World, when first planted, were founded and formed in, and with it: It was the Government of them from the beginning, and great would be the Joy in Heaven, and Earth, would you return to it again. Tell me, I beseech you, why should you not be perfectly reformed? Why should you not reform your selves in both Points, in the Primitive Form of Government, as a Christian Society, as well as in the Primitive Faith, as a Christian Self? You have great and laudable Zeal for all the positive Doctrines of Divine Revelation, and why not for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Polycarp.

positive Ordinances of Divine Institution? Nay, how comes it to pass that you, who retain all other things of Divine Institution, as Baptism, the Lord's Day, the Holy Eucharist, and Ordination, should reject this? What hath Episcopacy done, to be thus cast off, and to deserve Abdication? Hath it been so profaned, so abused, and so polluted in the Papal Church, as <sup>m</sup> Calvin tragically complains, and hath not almost every thing in the Christian Religion been so too? Restore it then in its ancient Purity with the Christian Doctrines to your Churches, or, as I should rather say, restore your Churches to it, that you may thereby, with the ancient Apostolical Faith of Divine Revelation, have the ancient Apostolical Government and Priesthood of Divine Institution, and thereby of a certainty recover the Mission, and become united to the Body of the Holy Catholick Church. Pardon my Christian Freedom, I beseech you; for I argue with you, and urge you, upon a received Principle, *quod omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper*, upon a Principle, that is attested by the same Witnesses, that attest the number of the Books, and the Divine Authority of the Scriptures; and therefore a Principle, which in arguing with you will admit of no Flattery, nor the least degree or semblance of Flattery, Compliment, or Complaisance. For Principles, believe me, *Sirs*, are Principles: they may easily be broken, but cannot be bent: Principles, especially Christian Principles, require free and plain dealing, especially among Christians, who ought neither to write or speak such things, or in such manner, when Divine Doctrines or Ordinances are in the case, as to please Men, but to please God. I say with the Apostle, to please God, who expects great Regard from his People as well to his *Positive* Laws, which he commands us to obey, as to his *Pos-*

<sup>m</sup> Epist. ad Sereniss. Regem Polonia. Genevæ Nonis Dec. M.D.LIV.

*five* Doctrines, which he commands us to believe ; to his revealed Political, as well as to any other of his revealed Doctrines ; to the Doctrines which the Church is concerned to practise, as a *Society*, as well as to those, which she is concern'd to profess, as a *Sect*. I would have address'd my self to you with more Latitude, and Compliance, could I have done it with a good Conscience. I might indeed have told you, that *the Succession of the Ministry is of less consideration than the Succession of the Faith, and subordinate to it, as the Means to the End.* But if this may serve as some Plea for those, who really using all Endeavours, yet could not have Episcopal Mission, and Priesthood, yet it could serve them no longer than they were in that supposed state of unavoidable, and insuperable Necessity, which never was, nor now is your case. I might also have told you, *it was reasonable to presume, that God of his infinite Goodness may supply the want of his own Ordinance among you.* But this I could not do for some Reasons: *First*, because the Cases wherein Men presume, or rather hope, that God of his infinite Mercy and Goodness will make such Supplies and Allowances, are cases of invincible Ignorance, or invincible Necessity, not to be avoided by any Pains or Endeavours, neither of which, I am called to say it again, either is, or ever was your case. *Secondly*, because the Goodness of God, if he pleases, may in such cases supply all Defects in Churches as well as *one*, even the want of all Ministry as well as the want of that Ministry which we think you ought to have ; nay even the want of Sacraments in those Religious Societies, which reject them : And therefore, in the *third place*, those extraordinary Mercies being Secrets, which belong to God himself, ought to be no Encouragement to us to cast off his Institutions, or to continue in the want of them, when we may have them. It is not therefore reasonable, as I conceive, to presume,

that God, tho' infinitely merciful and good, will supply unto us the want of such things, which we may supply our selves with, but will not. I had much rather therefore desire you not to trust to those extraordinary Supplies, which, when God grants, we cannot tell whether he grants or no. His known, ordinary, covenanted Mercies are the greatest, and most comfortable Security for all Churches, as well as for all particular Christians, and therefore your truest Security will be to reform your Churches into the first Divine Government, Ministry, and Priesthood, in which for certain they were first formed. Nay rather than seem to flatter you with the hopes of God's supplying the want of those things by his extraordinary Mercy, I would for God's sake beseech you to consider how far the present Constitution of your Churches agrees, or disagrees with your, and our Belief of the *Holy Catholick Church*, or the *one Catholick and Apostolick Church*, which is the Corporation of all true Christians, and of all true Churches founded into *one* Communion by *one* Priesthood, as well as upon one Confession of Faith; and I leave it to your selves, after serious Consideration, to determine whether you want of that Ministry, in which the whole Catholick Church, and all the Members of it were founded as in an unchangeable divine Institution, doth not press you with great Difficulties, which relate to that new Frame, and Constitution of a Church, which you have devised for your selves, so different from the primitive Form.

All this I have said to you in Answer to my Adversary's Objection; but why do I say *my* Adversary? for you'll find he's as much an Adversary to your Churches, and Ministry, as ours. He makes this Objection of " *your unchurching your selves by throwing off the Episcopal Government*, with an ill



Design upon you, as well as upon us. He would render us odious unto you for maintaining the Principle, upon which we have reformed, and which I think it is not in the Power of Man to change. But if you will not come up to that Principle, and Practice, we hope you will still not only bear with us, but still approve what we have done in reforming our selves. But as strict, and inviolable a Principle, as I take it to be, yet I protest, in the Presence of God, so far am I from having any ill will to you, who I think live in the violation of it, that as the Apostle of his great Affection for his Brethren said he could wish, that he were *accursed for them from Christ*; so my Love is so passionate for you all, and my Goodwill so great; that I could wish for your sakes it were not a Principle, but what God hath made so for all Times, and Places, cannot be unmade; what he hath so joined with his Church, no Man ought to put asunder from it, nor lay other Foundation for that holy Building, than he hath laid, who is the Founder, as well as the chief Corner-stone of it, and purchased it with his most precious Blood. I appeal to what in great Kindness, and Pity I formerly ° preached and published in behalf of some of you, for the Sincerity of this Declaration, nor do I repent in the least of the good Character I have given of them, tho' Monsieur Baudan's Sermon, not long ago preached and printed at *DELFT*, in which the Church of *England* is so deeply concerned, perhaps would make some other Men repent.

Thus much I have said in Answer to my Adversary, with all the tenderness for the Protestant Churches, who plead Necessity for their not having the Episcopal Government, and Ministry, for which many of their Pastors have expressed great respect. But there is another Protestant Church which pleads

---

° In a Sermon, entituled, *The true Notion of Persecution stated.*

not Necessity to excuse their Abdication of Episcopacy, but declares it was their Duty to cast it off, as an unlawful Antichristian Constitution, contrary to the Word of God; and pursuant thereunto have more than once deposed their own Bishops, forced some of them by Persecution to renounce their Episcopal Function, and entered into a solemn League, and Covenant, which they still think obliging, to endeavour the destruction of it. If the ancient Fathers, who were Saints, and Martyrs, were now living to see such a strange Church, how astonished would they stand at the sight of it, and with what holy Indignation would they thunder against the iniquity of it, and charge the People to separate themselves from the Ministry of it as from *Corab*, and his Company, least they perished with them in their Sin. They would think such a pretended Church no better then a Band of Rebels against the Catholick Apostolick Church, and altogether unworthy of the name of a Church, as being not only an absolute variation from the Church of Christ as to its Polity, and Mission, but a sworn Confederacy against them, even the Abomination of Desolation, in the House, or Kingdom of God, of which they would think their Pastors not Ministers, but by their old Principles most malicious Enemies, not Pastors of the Flock but Wolves, to many of both which notwithstanding I trust, that God who can make Dispensations, and Allowances for the greatest Ignorances, Mistakes, and Prejudices of his frail Creatures, which Men cannot make, will shew Mercy in the Great Day, according to the Prayer of our Lord upon the Cross, *Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.*

I have now answered the invidious Objection of our worthy Author against the Necessity of the Episcopal Government, and now cannot but desire my Readers to reflect a little with me on his great

Disingenuity, who loads us of this Opinion with bitter Invectives, and opprobrious Names, although he hath laid it down as the Foundation of his whole Work, that all Men, except Atheists, have not only a natural Freedom, but a strict natural Right to believe, and profess such speculative Points, as they think true, and to follow the Dictates of their own Understandings in all religious Matters, to which, he saith, the Magistrates Power doth not extend. Yet without any Consideration of us, or the Antiquity, and Universality of our Principle among Christians, and contrary to his own Doctrine of *natural Right*, he upbraids and ridicules us for it, though he knows we follow the dictates of our own Consciences in believing, and professing of it, and as much as in him lies, he endeavours to expose, and theaterize us, and our Opinion, as it were to put us in the Pillory with it written on our Breasts, that That may be flouted, and we pelted for it by the Mob. His Disingenuity is no less observable in charging our Principle with great seeming Concern, as destructive to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland: Those, saith he, who are for Episcopacy, jure divino, if they act, and speak consistently with their Opinion, can have no favourable Opinion of the Revolution, whereby in Scotland the true Church, by the abolition of Episcopacy, hath been destroyed. Good God! what Stuff is this for a Man to vent, who would be thought some great one among the Writers against the Church; for first, Why should not they, who believe the divine Right of Episcopacy, act, and speak, and write too consistently with their Opinion, which they have a natural Right to believe, and profess? Secondly, How can they help the Consequences of their Opinion, more than other Men can help the Consequences of theirs, who, he saith, must judge for themselves in Matters of Religion, or more than he himself can help the Consequences of his, whose Opinion of Churches,

and of the Absurdities of the independent Power, destroys the Scottish Presbyterian Church, as effectually, as the Episcopal Church of *England*; I say the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, which carries the independent Power, and all the Absurdities he charges upon it, much higher, than the *Highest Flyers* of the Church of *England* ever did, or now do. *Lastly*, What hath this Opinion to do with the Revolution, more than that of the *High-scotized Flyers* (pardon me for using one of his scurrilous Names) among the Presbyterians, who in both Nations, by his way of reasoning, must have no favourable Opinion of the Revolution, which hath continued the Antichristian, unlawful Episcopal Form of Government in the Church of *England*, and *Ireland*, though never so contrary to the Word of God. Doth he not know that Men may like a Government, and yet have no favourable Opinion of some Proceedings in it? Or hath he forgot<sup>r</sup> what he saith, that in a Society, and by consequence in all Governments, Men must be determined even in things they do not like, by the greater Number, as having the greater Force. But any turn of Speech, or Fallacy will serve as an Argument against the Church of *England*, and Her Clergy, if it will expose them. He represents Her Hierarchy as the *spiritual Babylon*, whose Fall will be great, and notwithstanding all his Declamations against Persecution, he persecutes Her, and Her loving, and dutiful Sons, through his whole Book, even as the Children of *Edom* did *Jerusalem*, when they said *down with it, down with it, even to the Ground*. He will not allow Her to maintain Her self, and her Assemblies, neither by *his* natural, nor *Her own* diyine Right. In short, all Her Sons, who derive not Her Power from the People, but God, all that are not, as he himself is, Sons of *Belial*, or *Lazitude*, or *Disguise*, he would if he could, if he durst,



take them, or make the People take them, as *Children of Babylon, and dash them in pieces against the Stones.* I appeal to the strain of his whole Book for the Truth, at least for the Probability of what I say, and indeed if they are such, as he with all his Art, and Malice represents them to be, they deserve but little better Usage, if by Principle they indeed are *Enslavers of Mankind*; and as certain of their Poets said of us, with a Love, and Respect like that of his,

——— *Surcingle Knaves,*

*Whose Lives make Atheists, and their Doctrine Slaves.*

His next Objection is against the *Bishops deriving their Right by an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the Catholick Church.* In answer to which I must observe, that, as he hath urged all the Statutes of the Realm against the Church of England, just as the Popish Writers have done: So like them also, and I have Reason to believe with the same Design, he hath drawn Arguments against the Succession of her Bishops, who derive their Succession from the *Church of Rome*, because we charge her with many grievous Corruptions, and notwithstanding acknowledge Her, to be a *true Church*, which he pretends to prove is absurd for us to do, if she hath so many, and such great Faults as we accuse her of.

He's not wanting in his usual Rhetorick to expose us upon that account. *They have* <sup>1</sup>, saith he, *more favourable Thoughts of the Papists whom they reverence, as a true Church, than of the Protestant Dissenters, whom they reckon no other than (the vilest thing in their Eyes) a mere Lay-Mob.* This is one of the many kind Strokes of his Pen to halloo the *Mob* upon us, and needs no other Reflection. For every wise Man knows, that though we own the Church of *Rome* for

ccxxii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

a true Church, it is purely in the metaphysical sense of the Word, as true signifies *real*, and not in the moral sense. So the Devil is a true Angel, or Spirit, as true signifies *verity of Essence*, though he is a lying Spirit, and the Father of Lyes. So in verity of Essence Judas was a true, or real Man though he was a Traitor, and betrayed his Lord: He wants not Learning to know this difference between true in a metaphysical, and true in a moral Sense; and also knows very well, that although we own the Church of Rome for a true, that is, for a real Church, yet we have no Reverence, or Veneration for her, as a corrupt degenerate Church; that very Charge which he cannot but confess we lay upon her, and for which perhaps he is secretly angry at us, is a sufficient Vindication of us from the odious Imputation of our reverencing the Church of Rome. Should a Man charge him with many, and grievous Corruptions in Manners, and yet own him for a true, that is, a real Christian, I believe he would not thank him, or think himself much obliged to him, though he should profess to him, and all the World at the same time, that notwithstanding the heavy Charge he had brought, and proved against him, he had a respect for him, as a Christian Man; and would not be great Injustice in others to treat that Man, as one that had a Reverence for Sinners, because he owned him for a Christian notwithstanding all the Immoralities which he laid to his Charge. He saith that we allow the Church of Rome to be a true Church for no other Reason, than because by our hypothesis of Ecclesiastical Government, we find it necessary for the Support of our own. But it is very well known, that we do not only allow her, and assert her to be so, but have proved it by such Arguments, as he cannot answer, notwithstanding the Schism, and Idolatry,

and Tyranny, and other Corruptions, which we lay to her Charge. All his Arguments upon this Head against us, and the Church of *England* were long since fully answered by Archbishop *Laud* in his Conference with *Fisher* the Jesuit, and lately by my self in "the Book cited in the Margin, p. 79. and from p. 139. to p. 150. My Adversary had as subtle, and sophistical a Brain as *Fisher*, and as he dressed up *Fisher*, in new Cloathes: So the Author of the Rights hath dressed up *him*, and I refer the Reader to my Answer, to which my Adversary hath never yet replied, and I challenge this *Goliath*, who defies and insults the Clergy from the beginning of his *Preface* to the end of his Book, to make a Reply to it, if he can.

As to the " Answer which *Beza* made at the Conference of *Poissy*, to the Objection which was brought against himself, and the Protestant Ministers, for want of a Mission, it is the same in substance with that which *Quakers*, and *Anabaptists*, and some other Sectaries make to the same Objection. And it is deplorable to consider, that from *Beza* to Mr. *Claude*, the French Ministers would suffer themselves to be pressed with an Objection, to which they could make no other Answer, but that *Gifts*, and a good Life, and sound Doctrine, and the Election of the People, was sufficient to a lawful and valid Call to the Ministry. I can assure our Author that my Lord Chancellor *Clarendon*, whom he thinks he wittily \* calls the Favouring Author of High Church, did not think such a Call with Presbyterian Ordination lawful, and for that reason never would communicate with the French Protestants, neither in his first or second being in France. For which reason

\* Several Letters, which passed between Dr. George Hickes, and a Popish Priest: London, printed for Richard Saxe, 1705.

\* P. 335. Thuan. Hist. Tom. 2. L. 28. P. 45.

\* P. 342.

## CCXXIV *A Prefatory Discourse*

the famous Mr. *Claude*, the chief Minister of *Charenton*, inveigh'd bitterly against him, and Dr. *Mortley*, and others, for refusing Communion with them, in a Discourse I had with him 36 Years ago at his own House about their Mission, too long to be recited here. What he cites out of *Vol. II. p. 73, 74, 75.* of that Noble Historian, is not at all for his purpose. It neither proves the Church of *Rome* not to be a true Church, or the Mission of the *French* Ministers to be a valid Mission, nor is it for the Honour of the *French* Protestants, as any Man may see, that will read the whole Passage; but let his Intention, or Malice be what it will in citing of it, he must permit me to refer him to another Passage in that Prince of Historians, *Vol. III. B. XIII. p. 345, 346.* I had rather for the sake of the *French* Protestants, any body should have the Mortification of transcribing it than my self. But if he pleases to consult it, there he will find that his Lordship was an *High-flyer* of the *Landean* Faction, as he terms it, who thought, <sup>y</sup> that *there could not be a more deadly Wound to the Church of England, than to have it thought indifferent whether one were of the Presbyterian, or of her Communion.*

I do not think my self obliged to answer what he hath transcribed out of the Bishop of *Sarum's* Exposition upon the XXIII<sup>d</sup> Article, for some Reasons. *First*, because I think what I have already written in my two Letters, and in this Preface, may pass for an Answer to it. And *secondly*; because his Lordship's Exposition of the XXXIX Articles hath <sup>z</sup> received some censure already in the Lower House of Convocation, from Men whom I look upon as not

<sup>y</sup> Vol. III. B. XIII. p. 346.

<sup>z</sup> In the humble Representation of the Lower House, May 30. 1701. After which the House drew up a Paper of Specialities, which was not received by the Upper House.



inferior to his Lordship in the study of true Divinity: And *thirdly*, because his Exposition on the XXIII<sup>d</sup> Article, which my Adversary cites, hath received at least one solid answer, to which, with submission to his Lordship, and with all respect to him, I think he stands still indebted for a just and full Reply. But tho' I decline making an Answer to what is cited by the Author of the *Rights* out of that Exposition, yet with all Humility I beg leave for my better information, and satisfaction, to ask his Lordship a few Questions. *First*, whether his Lordship's Latitude-Exposition of the XXIII<sup>d</sup> Article concerning the *Lawful Calling and Mission of Ministers* be agreeable to the stricter Expressions of the Church in other places, as particularly in her *Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the Preface thereunto*. In the former it is the Bishop only that gives Authority to the Deacon, and commits the Sacerdotal Power to the Priest by the Imposition of his, with the Presbyters Hands, giving him Authority to preach, and administer the Sacraments, and loose Sinners in the Name of the Father, &c. So in the Consecration of a Bishop, the Person consecrated to the Episcopal Order and Office hath all the Power of it committed vnto him by the Imposition of the Hands of the consecrating Bishops: And in the Preface the Church declares, *first*, that these three Offices have been in the Church of Christ from the time of the Apostles; and *secondly*, that they were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no Man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, &c. and also by publick Prayer with Imposition of Hands were approved; and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority; And *thirdly*, that no Man shall be accounted, or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions,

except

except he be called, &c. and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following, or *hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.* So in the *Act for Uniformity* 14 *Carol.* II. which seconds and confirms the Order of the Church, it is *enacted*, that no Person whatsoever shall be capable to be admitted to any Parsonage, &c. or any Ecclesiastical Promotion, or Dignity, nor shall presume to administer the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, before such time as he shall be ordained Priest according to the Form and Manner in and by the *said Book* prescribed, *unless he have formerly been made Priest by Episcopal Ordination.* So in the Canons, whenever there is mention of Ordination, there is also mention of Bishops, as in *Canon* 31, 32, 33, 34. So in the Articles for the Clergy made by the Province of *Canterbury* 1584. the first Article, which provides, that none but fit Persons shall be admitted to Holy Orders, supposes that none but Bishops could ordain, as in those Expressions, *Quod si vero aliquis Episcopus aliquem ad sacros Ordines admiserit: Ne quis Episcopus aliquem in beneficium instituat, &c.*

These Observations being premised, I desire to ask his Lordship in the *second* place, whether these things ought not to have been his Lordship's Rule in his Exposition of the *lawful Authority* mentioned in the xxiii. Article, which in the *Preface* to the Form, and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating, &c. can signifie nothing but the *Episcopal Authority*, to which it is there restrained. *Thirdly*, I desire to know, that if our Church owns such Ordinations, and *Missions* as his Lordship mentions in his Exposition, as lawful, and valid; with what Consistency to herself, or to that Correspondence, Fellowship and Communion which ought to be among Christian Churches, she can so positively refuse to let the Ministers of other Protestant Churches execute their ministerial Office, or have any ministerial Charge within

*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* ccxxvii

within her Pale, before they are Episcopally ordained? *Fourthly*, I desire to know whether our Reformers, and their Successors not (*expressly*) questioning, condemning, or annulling the Ordinations, and Missions of the Ministers of the other Protestant Churches for *Eighty Years*, as his *Lordship* saith, amounts to an Argument that they owned, and approved them? If so, then I would ask, whether the *Non-concurrence* of the Upper House of Convocation with the Lower to censure his *Lordship's* Exposition be an approving of the same? *Fifthly*, I desire to know if the Authority of the Clergy, who have questioned the Lawfulness of their Ordinations and Missions, and utterly excluded them from ministring in our Church, since the term of those *Eighty Years* mentioned by his *Lordship*, be not as good an Argument against their Ministry, as the not questioning of it before that time was for it. *Sixthly*, I desire to know if God hath not appointed *one Priesthood* for the one universal Church of Christians dispersed through the whole World, as he did for the *one* particular Church of the *Jews*; and if he did, whether another Priesthood of a private Man's setting up in a Family, as that of *Michah* was, or another publick Priesthood, as that of *Jeroboam's* setting up in a Kingdom for *Politick Reasons* of State, are more justifiable in the Christian, than in the *Jewish Church*? I ask this Question, because I cannot yet think, as his *Lordship* doth, that *we are at liberty, as to our thoughts, concerning the Subject of that lawful Authority*, which is to call, send, and ordain Men to the Ministry in the Christian Church.

I might ask many more Questions; as whether if one *Michah* cannot make a lawful Priest, an hundred or thousand *Michahs* together can make one? and whether the Men who let themselves be made Priests by *Michah*, and King *Jeroboam*, did not commit as great a Sin, as they who made them

ccxxviii *A Prefatory Discourse*

Priests? I might also ask if one Place, Country, or Kingdom, which wants a lawful Priesthood, I mean Priests ordained by the Authority of God's appointing, ought not after the example of the *Bohemians* to send over all the World, and fetch Priests of such a Priesthood, like the most precious Merchandise, from the remotest Countries; and if they ought, whether there<sup>a</sup> ever was or can be such a<sup>b</sup> Necessity for Kings or People to make Ministers, as his Lordship supposeth? or allowing that there was such a Necessity, whether, the Necessity ceasing, those Ministers made in that Necessity, and their Ministry, did not cease with it? because the Law of Necessity, from which his Lordship argues, can last no longer than the Necessity it self. I also beg leave to ask his Lordship, whether that Case happening in any Christian Country, where *Kings, or States, are jealous of their Subjects going elsewhere for regular Ordinations*; I say, I desire to know whether that case happening in any part of Christendom just as his Lordship describes it, p. 260. be not the same with the Case of *Jeroboam*, and his Priests, or very like it? I desire also to be inform'd by his Lordship, whether that or any other case of Necessity, when it authorizes a Company of Christian People, or the Supreme Magistrate over them [Let their<sup>a</sup> whole Body and Wills be never so much comprehended, and concluded in him] to constitute Ministers, it also authorizes them to sink, or suppress any Order of the Ministry, especially the Supreme Order of Bishops? Methinks it must be a strange Necessity, that authorizes Men to set up a Ministry in part, and not in whole, to supply the want of the ordinary Mission, and not to supply it in perfection: *Jeroboam*, who for the same *Political Reasons*, which

<sup>a</sup> *Rich. Montacutii Episcopi Norwicensis Originum Ecclesiasticarum Tomi prioris pars posterior, p. 463, 464.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Reasonableness of Toleration, &c. Letter V. p. 208.*

<sup>c</sup> *Exposition, p. 260.*

<sup>d</sup> *Exposition, p. 258.*



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* ccxxix

his *Lordship* allows, set up Priests of his own Creation, made High-Priests as well as Priests. I might ask his *Lordship* more Questions, but I will conclude, most humbly beseeching him to consider, whether instead of writing up the other Protestant Churches to the Church of *England*, as one would think a Bishop should do, he hath not written her down to them in his Exposition of the XXIII<sup>d</sup> Article, and upon supposition (for things may be supposed that never will be) that Episcopacy should be abdicated for *Politick Reasons* here, as in other Countries, what his *Lordship* could say after such large Concessions, in defence of his own most Sacred Apostolick Order, why it should not be deposed. <sup>†</sup> He hath observed of it, *that the World received the Christian Religion with it, that all the Corners of the Christian Church, and all the parts of it, the sound as well as the unsound; that is, the Orthodox as well as the Hereticks, and Schismaticks, agreed in it.* His *Lordship* also observes, *that it was the Government of the Church, when the Fury of Persecution, which always was the Bishops Portion, made it no desirable thing to be a Bishop; and in a course of many Centuries, when nothing but Poverty and Labour was got by the Employment, and when there were no Princes to set it on, as an Engine of Government, and no Synods of Clergymen gathered to assume that Authority to themselves by joint Designs and Endeavours.* And can it be imagined, saith he, *that in all that glorious Cloud of Witnesses to the Truth of the Christian Religion, who as they planted it with their Labours, so watered it with their Blood, there should not be one single Person found, on whom either a Love of Truth, or Envy at the Advancement of others, prevailed so far, as to declare against such an early and universal Corruption (if it is to be esteemed one.) When all this is complicated together, it is really of so great Authority, that I love not to give the proper*

\* P. 260.

† Pref. to the Life of Will. Beddel Bishop of Kilmore.

CCXXX      *A Prefatory Discourse*

*Name to that Temper, that can withstand so plain a Demonstration.* This is his Lordship's Character of Episcopacy, and I cannot but think, that a Government so set up, and so universally received by all Christians, and in all Churches, deserves to be thought not only *Not-Criminal*, but necessary, as a Divine Institution, not alterable by the Will of Men; and that it ought not to be given up to Men of *that Temper* his Lordship then had in his Eye, or to be sacrificed to *Politick Reasons*, or the Interest and Ambition of any Mortal, or the Humour of an ignorant, deceived, or otherwise stubborn and obstinate People. I think we ought rather to bear our testimony for it unto Blood.

But to go on, our Author, in his last Chapter, hath rather outdone than fallen short of himself in bold Assertions, and in spiteful and scurrilous Expressions and Reflections upon the Clergy; and tho' others think he hath written it, as the rest of his Book, with a design to confound all Revealed Religion as much as he can, except what the *Unitarians* own; yet considering who the Author is, I am of opinion it is written rather with a design to destroy the Church of *England*, and serve the Interests of the Church of *Rome*, to which he either went over, or was going over in the Reign of the late *K. James*. And I think it is impossible for a serious Man to read it, without suspecting, that he is either a *Theist* or a *Papist* in his Heart. That which he undertakes to prove in it is, *That the Catholick Church consists of several Bodies, as independent on each other, as so many several States or Kingdoms, and that none of them hath Power to make Clergymen, but for themselves.*<sup>b</sup> His first Argument is a *Simili*: If they (saith he) who have the Supreme Temporal Power in one Country, cannot give one a Right to exercise any Civil Jurisdiction, or even any Ministerial Office in another not subject to them, the Reason is equally

*in Answer to The Rights, &c. ccxxxi*

*concluding as to Ecclesiasticals. And by the same reason he, who is excommunicated in one National Church, is no more so in any other, than one who is outlaw'd in one Country is so in others. If he had pleased, he might with as much Boldness, and as little Truth or Proof, have asserted, that as he who is born in one Country hath no Right by virtue of his Birth to the particular Privileges of another: So a Man baptized in one Christian National Church hath no Right to Communion in another, or that he who is made a Member of the Church in one Nation, is not thereby made a Member of the Church in another, much less of all the National Churches in the World. But this he thought was too plain to deny Christians of one Country the Rights of their Baptism in another, Christians of all National Churches still believing and professing, as Christians have believed from the beginning, that the several Churches all the World over make up but one Catholick Church, of which Christ alone is the Head. He saw plainly that his new Assertion was directly contrary to the constant Notion that all Christians, in all Ages and Places, ever had of the Nature of the Universal Church, as of one Body made up of several Members; and therefore, saith he, to avoid these Consequences it is said, that every Nation is not a complete Body Politick within it self, as to Ecclesiasticals, but the whole Church; say they, composes such a Body, and Christ is the Head of it. Here, as is usual with him, he couples several equivocal Expressions and Fallacies together; for if by every Nation he means every National Church, who is it that saith every National Church, or a Church, when it is National, is not a complete Body Politick within it self? or who will not allow every Church, whether National, or not National, to be as complete a Body within it self, as every College in Ox-*

ccxxxii *A Prefatory Discourse*

ford is, tho' but a part of that greater Society, and more noble Body, the *University*, of which the Chancellor is the Head. Those who assert, that all the National Churches in the World make up one Universal Church, not only own them, but every Diocesan Church in them to be complete Bodies under their several Bishops, tho' neither they, nor the National Church consisting of them, when there are more Churches, is the whole Catholick Church, of which Christ alone is the Head; indeed no more than all the Companies, or Sodalities of *London*, each of which is a complete Society in it self, is the whole Body of the City, of which *my Lord Mayor* is Head. Here I cannot but note his Expression, *say they*: The whole Church, *say they*, composes such a Body; and who are they that say so? Even the whole Church that composes such a Body hath ever said it, whatever he saith to the contrary now. But still he will go on: *Christ's Headship*, saith he, *makes Christians no more one Body Politick with respect to Ecclesiasticals, than to Civils. His Precepts equally extend to both, and the whole Earth is God's and Christ's Kingdom; and yet the Kingdoms of the Earth are distinct, and independent of one another, and so are all National Churches.* Here is still the same Assertion again in other words, with some shew of proof; *viz.* that *National Churches* are as distinct, and independent of one another, as so many several worldly Kingdoms, and Commonwealths. In answer to which I must observe, *first*, that as to the Notion of the *Catholick Church*, and Christ's Headship over it, it is purely accidental, whether the particular Churches, which are Members of it, be *national*, or *not national*, or whether any one of them be in one and the same Nation or Dominion, or in several: For as the Parochial Churches often happen to be in two Civil Jurisdictions, as in *London* and *Westminster*, and Dioceses in two or three different Counties; so the same Provincial, nay Diocesan Churches may be in different Nations; and the particular



ticular Churches, which make up the whole *Catholick Church*, be they *national*, or not *national*, in one or several Countries or Kingdoms, they are all parts of the same Body of which Christ is the Head. *Secondly*, I must observe that all the parts of the *Whole Catholick Church*, of which it is made one Body, are parts of the same Name and Nature with one another, and with the whole, or that the *Catholick Church* is one Homogeneous Body, consisting of Parts of the same Name and Nature with one another, and with the whole, in which respect it differs vastly from the Kingdoms, States, and Republicks of the Earth, which have different Names, and different Civil Natures, and Constitutions perfectly independent of each other, and which for that reason are not incorporate, or united into one Body, as particular Churches *national*, or not *national* are, as having the same Priesthood, the same Fundamental Laws, the same Discipline, the same Privileges, and Rights, and the same Rewards, and Punishments one, as the other; which the several Kingdoms, States, and Republicks of the World have not, and therefore though they all have God, *God* I say, for their Sovereign Lord, and Head in Heaven, as several independent Kingdoms, and other Dominions have the Kings of *Spain* for their Earthly Sovereign, yet as he speaks, they are not thereby united *with respect to Civils*, but notwithstanding the Supreme Dominion, and Headship of God over them, they all still remain *distinct, and independent* Sovereignties vastly different from each other in their respective Constitutions, and Rights. But it is not so in the Churches that are in the World, which being only lesser Societies, or Parts of the same Nature, and Constitution, are perfectly united, and incorporated together into the one whole great Body Politick of the *Catholick Church* under their one common Lord, and Head Christ.

Having given the Reason from the sameness of  
Nature

ccxxxiv     *A Prefatory Discourse*

Nature in all the Parts of the Catholick Church as in the whole, why Christians all the World over make one Body Politick in Ecclesiasticals, tho' not in Civils, I proceed to examine the two Arguments he brings to prove the contrary. *First*, he saith, *Christ's Precepts equally extend to both*, which is so far from being true, that it is notoriously false. For Christ as Head of the Church, hath given it many *peculiar* Ecclesiastical Precepts, and Commands, as God gave to the Jewish Church, which he hath not given to the Empires, Kingdoms, and States of the World, and obliged it as a spiritual Society to many *peculiar* Duties and Offices in all places, to which he hath not obliged them, otherwise than as *Christian*, but not as *Civil* Societies; not as Empires, Kingdoms, and States. *Secondly*, he saith, *the whole Earth is God's, and Christ's Kingdom*. To which I answer, that the whole Earth, and all the Kingdoms, and other Civil Dominions of it are God's, and Christ's Kingdom, as *God*, but not as *Messias* or *Christ*. For as Christ he is Head of no Kingdoms, but as they are his Churches, as it is written, *he is the Head of the Body the Church, and God hath given him to be Head over all things to the Church, from whom the whole Body (even all its Members) fitly framed together, and compacted by that which every Member supplieth maketh increase of the Body, or maketh the Body grow and increase unto the Edification of it self in Love*. I desire our Author now to consider, if the temporal Sovereignties of the World be thus compacted and joined together to Christ, or even to *God*, as their politick Head, and whether Christians, and Christian Churches in all the World called here the Joints or Members of the Body of Christ, are no more one Body Politick in Ecclesiasticals, under the Headship of Christ, than they are in Civils. I would also pray him to consider some other places, as where Christ is described as the Spouse, and Husband of the whole Church, but  
is

is he the Spouse of any one Kingdom, as it is a Kingdom, or Civil Society? Or do all the Kingdoms, as the Churches of the Earth, make up one Kingdom, or one Body Politick with him, of which he is the Head, as the Husband is of his Wife. Farthermore is he the Founder, and Head of Empires, States, and Kingdoms, and other temporal Principalities, as the Scripture saith he is of the Church, or in the same capacity and respect? Are they described in Scripture as Members of his Body, or are they collectively said to be his Body, as the whole Church is, or Members of it, as particular Churches are also said to be? Lastly, can it be said of them, or any of them, that as temporal Societies, they are the *House*, and *Household* of God, *the City of God*, or *the Kingdom of God*, or that they are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner Stone, in whom the whole Building fitly framed together maketh an holy Temple unto the Lord. If as temporal Societies they are his House, then unbelieving Empires, and Kingdoms are his Houses too, and as such are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles; of which he is the Corner-stone. More particularly, I would beseech our Author to consider, whether the Character and Description of Christ's *one* Kingdom in the Gospel, can belong to the independent Kingdoms of the World collectively considered, or to any one of them, tho' never so great? Or whether the Subjects of his Kingdom, and Provinces, or other Districts of it, in which they are scatter'd over the whole Earth in far distant, differently constituted, and independent temporal Sovereignties, are no more united under him in Ecclesiasticals, than in Civils? If they are no more united in *those*, than in *these*, they have no Politick Union at all, they are not parts joined, and compacted together into one Body, they are not edified as living Stones into one Building, nor have any relation to one another, as

# ccxxxvi    *A Prefatory Discourse*

Members of the same Body, or Parts of the same Whole. On the contrary, Christians every where are Brethren of the same Family, Members of the same Corporation, Citizens of the same City, Subjects of the same Kingdom, and the several Churches, in which they communicate, tho' *Antipodes* to one another, tho' in Countries of never so different Politics, Customs, Languages, and Government, are but as Apartments of the same House, as Wards of the same City, as Towns, Hundreds, Shires, Provinces of the same Spiritual Kingdom under one Ecclesiastical OEconomy, and Administration, whereof Christ is the Author as well as Sovereign Lord, and Head. The Wit of Man cannot devise apter Similitudes, or Comparisons to set forth the Unity of any Society, than those I have cited out of the New Testament, to prove the Union of all the Churches in the World into one Catholick Church. And as the Church is one: So it hath one Priesthood, one Faith, one Baptism, and in this one universal Church it is that all faithful Christians are of one Communion according to that Article in the Creed, I believe *the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints*. But this Man without any regard to Scripture, Creeds, or the Voice of Christianity it self, being resolved to have *many* independent Churches in the World of natural Right, instead of *one* Holy Catholick Apostolick Church of Divine Right, he ridiculously attempts to batter down her Ecclesiastical Unity with some of the same Artillery, that he planted before against the Power and Priesthood of the Clergy, *viz.* With the Statute 25 H. 8. which he discharges again against the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in behalf of the Peoples natural Right to make their own Church Governors, and unmake them at their Pleasure. Saith he, *It*



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* ccxxxvii

is notorious that with us (and so it was every where formerly, as I shall prove hereafter) the Bishops act ministerially, being under no less Penalty than a Præmunire obliged to confirm, and consecrate the Person named in the Congé d'élire. Again speaking of the Power of Ordination, as inherent in the Bishops, he<sup>k</sup> objects once more against it, as inconsistent with the Magistrates authorizing any two, or three Bishops, or even any single Bishop to lay Hands upon him, and by consequence the Power is derived from the Magistrate — and 'tis he who empowers them. Again, with us, saith he, (and 'tis the same in other Protestant Countries, which have Bishops) nothing can be plainer, than that the Bishops act ministerially, and by virtue of the Regal Commission, by which the Prince firmly enjoins, and commands them on the Fidelity, by which they are bound to him, to proceed according to the Form of the Statutes in Choosing, Confirming, and Consecrating. Strange words, saith he, for one, who is supposed to be a Subject to them, but more strange, that the disobeying him is under no less Penalty, than a<sup>l</sup> Præmunire, a greater Punishment than the Civil Ministers suffer for not obeying the Royal Mandate. The words and the Punishment shall be as strange, as he pleases, and truly I once heard as eminent a Lawyer as any of his Time speak of them, as *very strange*, but with a much better Intention than he. Indeed I think every serious Christian, who reflects not only upon the Doctrine, and Practice of the purest Ages of Christianity, as to the Episcopal Power, particularly in Ordination, but upon the first Article in the Charter of Hen. I. and the first Article of the great Charter, must think both *very strange* as well as other things, which Lawgivers of all Countries sometimes enact. And I cannot but ask our Author, who derives the Ecclesiastical Power of the Magi-

<sup>k</sup> P. 389.

<sup>l</sup> See Greenshield's Petition.

<sup>m</sup> Matth. Paris, Sanctam Dei Ecclesiam liberam facio.

ccxxxviii    *A Prefatory Discourse*

strate from the People, whether before the Empire turned Christian, the People authorized Bishops to consecrate and ordain? and whether in ordaining, they then acted Ministerially under them, or by virtue of any Commission, from them? And whether they were indispensably bound to consecrate, or ordain the Person they chose? And whether if they did not, the People, nay the People and Presbyters together, could command them on their *Fidelity*, or *Duty* to them or in any other Form of Authority, to proceed according to their Election to consecrate, or ordain? Or if they disobey'd, to suspend, or deprive them? which then would have been Punishments much *stranger* than the *Premunire* now is. Thus much upon this Occasion I thought fit to propose to our Author, upon his Scheme of forming independent Churches over the whole World *no more united in Ecclesiasticals, than in Civils.*

But to proceed, tho' I think I have sufficiently answered this *Crambe*-Objection already, I think fit to say something more to it by way of Question to our Author. As first, *Whether our Bishops, for instance, derive their sacerdotal Power of Consecration from our Kings and Queens in the same manner, and meaning, as other civil, and military Officers do, solely by virtue of the Royal Commission, and act ministerially under them, and by their Authority, just as these also do, purely as Ministers of the Crown, and not as Ministers authorized, and appointed by God.* Though he must answer in the Affirmative according to his own Scheme of Church-Government, and hath expressly said it in his Pref. p. XLIV. yet for Method's sake I am forced to ask this in order to the next Question, *Whether our Kings, and Queens, as other Supreme Magistrates (who he saith, derive all their Power from the People) could if they were not otherwise limited by Statute-Law, commission and authorize two or three of the Laity,*  
*imagine*

*imagine his worthy self, and Mr. T. and A. to consecrate a Bishop?* The reason I ask this is obvious. For if all Ecclesiastical Authority, and particularly this of consecrating Bishops is like all other Civil Power vested by the People in the Crown, and from thence again derived; the Queen, if not otherwise limited, might indifferently authorize any Men to do that Office as well as Bishops, which I presume none but such a Profligate as himself will affirm. In the third place I desire to know of him, *Whether the Supreme Magistrate, particularly a King or Queen of England in Person, may consecrate Bishops, or ordain Priests, or exercise other Sacerdotal Functions?* The reason of this Question is also plain. For if, <sup>a</sup> as he asserts, all Ecclesiastical Power, and particularly this of Consecration, be derived from the Supreme Magistrate, or as we commonly say, from the *Crown*, as all civil, and military Power certainly is; and if the Bishops appointed and authorized by the Royal Commission to consecrate, act *ministerially* in the same Sense of the Word, that other civil, and military Officers do, then not only our Kings, but our Queens, <sup>o</sup> as *Pontifices Maximi* may themselves consecrate in Person, because what they can authorize, or commissionate others to do, they may do themselves, as manage their own Revenues, fight their own Battels, and administer Justice in their own Courts; But this is such a sacrilegious Assertion, as I am confident none, but himself, and such, as like himself, are abandoned to all Modesty, as well as Principles, will, or dare assert. He was aware of this Consequence in his <sup>p</sup> Preface, as an Objection, and therefore he sily endeavours to smuggle it, by insinuating, that it is only for the same Reason our Princes cannot exercise the Ecclesiastical Function for which they cannot judge in Person. *Our Princes,*

---

<sup>a</sup> Pref. p. xlv.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid.

faith he, can no more judge in Person, than exercise the Ecclesiastical Function. But this Assertion is both against Reason, and Fact: Against Reason, as he may learn from <sup>a</sup> his Master *Hobbes*, and against Fact, as he may see in Mr. *Selden's* Notes upon these words, *Proprio ore nullus Regum Anglia* in the VIII<sup>th</sup> Chapter of Sir *John Fortescue's* Book *De Laudibus Legum Angliae*. The former shews how Sir *Edward Coke* put a Fallacy upon himself, by not distinguishing between committing, and transferring Power. And the latter proves from Rolls, and Charters, that our Kings sat in Court in the King's Bench. He may find many such Proofs elsewhere, as in *Hist. Cróyland continuat.* p. 458. And in old Charters nothing is more common, than Grants in such Terms as these: *Coram Nobis vel Capitali Justitiario nostro, aut per preceptum nostrum; nisi in presentia mea; nisi coram me vel ubi nominatim pracipero; non in placitum intrent, nisi in presentia nostra, vel heredum nostrorum, coram Nobismet ipsis, vel Capitali Justitia nostra.* He will find the same was customary in Normandy, if he pleases to consult *Neustria pia*, p. 253, 855. &c. and *Prewes. de l'Histoire d'Harcourt*, p. 1281. Also in Scotland as in K. *Malcolme's* Charter to *Coldingham*, *Nisi in presentia mea, vel in presentia supreme Justitie.* *Dalrymple's Collect.* p. 401. So in *Spelman's Gloss.* in the word *BANCUS.* *In eo presidebat olim Capitalis Anglia Justitiarius, & interdum ipse Rex. Hodie vero Capitalis, quem vocant, Justitiarius, tribus, vel quatuor assessoribus.* So in the word *Justitia*, p. 332. Col. 1. *Proceres, & Barones Regni, jure dignitatis, alii plurimi è tenura ratione complurimi etiam è Regum privilegio, ut copiose indicant diplomata, in placitum non vocarentur de tenementis suis nisi coram Rege, vel Capitali etiam Justiciario. Placita autem Civilia, vulgari- ter dicta Communia, sub illis seculis una agebantur in*

---

<sup>a</sup> Dialogue between a Philosopher, and a Student of the Common Laws of England, p. 55, 56.



*in Answer to The Rights, &c.* ccxli

*Palatio Regis coram ipso Rege, seu Capitali ejus Justituario.* So in *Mat. Paris* de vitis xxiii. Abbat. S. Albani, p. 143. *Unde mota ante Regem querela, tandem sententia ipso Rege, &c.* So *Abbas de Furno* dedit 200 *Marcas*, ut sit quietus de 500 *Marcis*, unde *amerciatus* fuit per os Regis. 7 *Johannis*, m. i. In the Proceedings against *Thomas a Becket*, *Rege cum Principibus* (*Pontificibus substractis*) sedente pro *Tribunali*, out of *Quadrilogus* by Dr. Brady in his *Compleat History of England*, p. 392. So in Mr. *Madox's Formulæ Angl. Form.* 659. *Facta fuit hac conventio in præsentia & curia Domini Henrici Regis (secundi.)* So in a Grant of *Hen. II.* pleaded in *Michaelis* 8<sup>vo</sup> *Johannis*, Rot. 10. dorso, *Berkshire: Henricus Rex &c. Sciatis me dedisse, & charta mea confirmasse Hugoni de Mara, pro homagio suo, & servitio in Feodo & hereditate, Dudecotam, cum omnibus pertinentiis; quam Robertus de Aubenio mihi clamavit, de se, & heredibus suis in curia mea apud Westmonast. coram me, & coram Baronibus, & Justitiariis meis; tunc ibidem præsentibus, pro concordia magni forisfacti sui, &c.*

So *Mich. & Hill.* 13 *Johan. Rot.* 7. *Eborum.* *Sciant præsentibus & futuri, quod hæc concordia facta in curia Domini Regis apud Turrim London. a die S. Michaelis in xv. dies, anno Regni Johannis 3. coram ipso Domino Rege, Simone de Pateshul, Jacobo de Poterna, Henrico de Potandener, Rogero Hufcarl, & aliis fidelibus Domini Regis tunc ibidem præsentibus; inter Gilbertum filium Rogeri, & Helewig uxorem suam, petentes, & Robertum Bainard tenentem &c. & sciendum quod Dom. Rex Johannes &c.* I refer our Author to *Merculf's Formulæ Solennes*, l. i. c. 25, and *Bignonius's Notes* thereupon, p. 287. And thence let him return home to these two domestick Records:

Placita coram Domino Rege apud Warewyck in  
Oâtabis S. Michaelis, anno Regni Henrici filii  
Regis Johannis 50. incipiente 51. Rot. 13.

*Gilbertus de Clare Com. Gloc. & Hertf. implacitavit  
Matildam, quæ fuit uxor Richardi de Clare, Comitis  
Glocestr. & Hertf. quod plus habuit dotis in terra sua,  
quam habere deberet, quia habuit castrum de Husk, &  
alias terras Wallenses guerrinas, cum non debeat habere  
eas neque castrum, &c. Postea recitata fuit loquela ista  
coram Domino Rege & Consilio suo, Ipso Domino Rege  
sedente pro Tribunali apud Westm.*

Communia de Termino Sancti Hillar. 39 H. 3. pe-  
nes Remem. Regis.

*Sedente Domino Rege in Scaccario venit Willielmus de  
Pakeham, Senescallus Episcopi Norwic. & petiit quen-  
dam magnum piscem monstruosum, captum in terra cu-  
jusdam pueri, qui est in custodia ipsius Episcopi, cujus  
Antecessores semper consueverunt habere Wrekum, ut di-  
cebat, sicut liquet, per inquisitionem quam Dominus Rex  
inde fieri fecit; & responsum fuit ei per Dominum Re-  
gem, quod ostenderet Chartas, si quas haberet, per quas  
clamaret talem libertatem, alioquin per Inquisitionem  
prædictam, in quam Rex se non posuit, nil caperet, maxi-  
me cum nullus habeat Wrekum, nisi per Dominum Re-  
gem in terra sua: Et tunc quesitum fuit a prædicto Wil-  
lielmo, utrum prædictus piscis captus fuit super terram  
vel in mari? Respondit quod in mari non longe a terra,  
& quod captus fuit vivum; ita quod circiter sex batelli  
submersi fuerunt, antequam posset capi. Et tunc respon-  
dit ei Dominus, quod de sicut ipse cognovit, quod piscis  
captus fuit in mari & vivus, non potuit esse Wrekum,  
voluit alias super habere considerationem. Et datus est  
ei dies, &c.*

After these Examples of Kings sitting, and admi-  
nistring Justice in their Courts of Judicature, I must  
ask him again, and all his Readers deceived by him,  
if the King empowers the Bishops to consecrate Bi-  
shops, just as he empowers his Judges to sit in his

Courts,

Courts, and administer Justice? Have they no more Power to consecrate, before he sends them the Mandate for Consecration, than the Judges have to sit in his Courts, and administer Justice before their Commission? Or doth their Power to consecrate commence with the Royal Mandate, as that of the Judges doth with their Patents? Do they act ministerially under him, when they consecrate, in the *same sense* as the Judges do when they administer Justice; that is; do they consecrate Bishops in the 'King or Queen's Name, and stead, and as the King or Queen's Representatives, as Judges administer Justice; or may the King or Queen preside over the Bishops in Consecration, whom he commands to consecrate, or act with them in the Holy Administration, as they formerly us'd to preside in their Courts, and administer Justice with their Judges, nay pronounce Sentence with their own Mouths. These Questions plainly shew, that the Acts of Parliament with which he assaults the Ecclesiastical Power, are only penal *restraining* Acts, by which the Bishops are required under the pains of *Pramunire*, to consecrate the Person nominated, and presented by the King or Queen, and no other. The very words of the Statute 25 H.8. c. 20. supposeth the Bishops to have the same Sacerdotal Power to consecrate Bishops, as to ordain Priests; and if an Act were now made to lay the same, or other penal Restraints upon them, as to Ordination of Priests, would it follow from thence, that in ordaining Priests, they acted ministerially under the Queen, and in her stead, and derived their Power of Ordination, as other civil, or military Officers derive theirs, from Her Majesty's Signet, or Broad Seal?

After writing all this to set the Question of the Bishops Power to consecrate Bishops in a true Light,

---

<sup>f</sup> *Cujus personam in judicio, & judicando, representant. Bracton. lib. iii. c. 10. f. 108.*

## cclxiv     *A Prefatory Discourse*

I need make no difficulty to say the same of it, and every other part of their Sacerdotal Power, what two very Learned Men, the Bishop of *Lincoln*, and Dr. *Kennet* Dean of *Peterborough*, say of their Power to summon and hold Convocations.

‘ The Statute of the 25 of *Hen. VIII.* had not any other influence on the state of these Assemblies (the Convocation) than only this : That whereas before the Archbishop might, whenever he pleased, without any other direction, by his own proper motion have summon’d his Clergy to his Synod ; now he may do it but by the King’s Writ to warrant him therein : but as for the Power of calling them, this is still left to him, as before ; his Mandate runs in the same Form, and by his Summons it is, and by no other, that our Convocations do assemble at this day.

‘ “ Should we ever be so unhappy under a Christian Magistrate, as to be denied all liberty of these Assemblies, though the Governors and Fathers of the Church should with all their Care and Interest endeavour to obtain it ; should he so far abuse his Prerogative, as to turn it not only to the detriment, but to the ruin of all true Religion and Morality among us, and thereby make it absolutely necessary for something extraordinary to be done to preserve both : In such a case of extremity, I have before said, and I still adhere to it, the Bishops and Pastors of the Church must resolve to hazard all in the discharge of their Duty ; they must meet, consult, and resolve upon such Measure, as, by God’s Assistance, they shall think their unhappy Circumstances to require, and be content to suffer any Loss, and to run any Danger for so doing.

---

\* The State of the Church and Clergy of *England*, &c. By *William Wake*, D. D. Dean of *Exeter*, ch. 1. sect. 20.

“ Ibid. ch. 3. §. 12.



To this purpose Mr. Dean, *Kennet*, in the " Preface to his *Ecclesiastical Synods*, declares, That one Motive of writing it was this: ' To assert the ' Nature of the Christian Church, as a Society endowed with Fundamental Rights, to preserve its ' *own Being*; and among these a Right for the Governors to assemble and agree upon the common ' Measures of Faith and Unity, as at first independent on the *Heathen*, so even now on the *Christian* ' Magistrate, when the Necessities of Desertion and ' Persecution so require.

So in p. 98. of the Book: ' Indeed if an *English* Synod find it necessary to support Religion by some ' new Constitutions, and upon the prospect of such ' a Necessity, desire the Prince's Leave to provide ' for it; and the Prince long and often denies that ' *Leave*, with design of letting the Church being ' incapable to consult her own Preservation: in such ' a case (which is not Ours) let the Church be true ' to Christ, and to the Powers she received from ' Him. This is the Original Right which we assert.— So in p. 82. saith he, ' Therefore for all ' this Act of Submission, Dr. *Wake* would not have ' our Princes think, that the Convocations of the ' Clergy should depend on their mere arbitrary Will, ' but on the Benefit of the Church, and the great ' occasion of Religion. For he says, p. 145. *Notwithstanding any thing that hath been hitherto said, I shall not doubt to affirm, that whenever the King is in his own Conscience convinc'd, that for the Convocation to sit and act be for the Glory of God, the Benefit of the Church, or otherwise for the publick Good and Welfare of his Realm; he is oblig'd both by the Law of Reason as a Man, by his Duty to God as a Christian, and by his Duty to his People as a Ruler set over them for their good, to permit, or rather to command his*

‘ Clergy to meet in Convocation, and to transact what is fit, for any or all these Ends, to be done by them. So in p. 83. he cites the Bishop for saying, when the King doth abuse his Trust, ‘ *When the Exigencies of the Church call for a Convocation—I confess the Church has a Right to its sitting; and if Circumstances be such as to require their frequent sitting, during those Circumstances it has a Right to their frequent meeting and sitting; and if the Prince be sensible of this, and yet will not suffer the Clergy to come together; in that case I do acknowledge, that he wou’d abuse the Trust that is lodg’d in Him, and deny the Church a Benefit which of right it ought to enjoy.* So in p. 84. he cites him for saying, That ‘ *whenever the Civil Magistrate shall so far abuse his Authority, as to render it necessary for the Clergy, by some extraordinary Methods to provide for the Church’s Welfare, that Necessity will warrant their taking of them.* So in p. 85. he recites from Dr. Atterbury this Passage out of the Bishop of Sarum’s History of the Reformation, ‘ *That the extreme of raising the Ecclesiastical Power too high in the Times of Popery, had now produced another of depressing it too much; so seldom is the Counterpoise so justly balanc’d, that Extremes are reduc’d to a well-temper’d Mediocrity.*

Our Author hath other trifling Sophistical Arguments against Church-Governments being placed by God in the Apostles, and their Successors, which, as the Archbishop of Spalato \* observes, are all Arguments

---

\* *Sed post Christi ascensum in cælum, quod genus regiminis per homines mortales exercendi idem Christus in Ecclesia reliquit & instituerit, erit nobis in hoc primo libro inquirendum. Quæsitum proculdubio facti duntaxat est, ut loquuntur jurisperiti — Quanam vero forma regiminis ei magis plaquerit, hæriolandum non est, sed ex ipso facto inquirendum — Is tamen modus (regiminis) sit ne Monarchicus, an Aristocraticus, an Democraticus, an ex his mixtus, non tam ex nostra speculatione, & dialecticis humanæ sapientiæ rationibus pendat, quam ex ipso facto Christi. Optime sane monuit Onuphrius Panvinus non esse fidelis historici rem describere, ut fieri debuisset, sed*

ments against *Fact*; and any Man will easily discern the weak and fallacious Nature of them, who understands the true Nature of Church Government, or the true Constitution of the *Catholick Church*, which was committed in *part*, and in *whole*, *severally* and *jointly*, to the Apostles and their Successors, as I have partly shew'd in the following Letters; and the true *Idea* of it may be learned by those, who are not yet Masters of it, from *Spalatensis's* Book cited in the Margin, or from the Works of St. Cyprian, which those, who understand not *Latin*, may read in the *French* Translation, or from an excellent little Book, entituled, *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, printed for Walter Kettibby in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1695. and in the Vindication of it, and of the *Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction*, printed for Robert Clavel and George Strahan, 1701. to which I refer the Reader.

As for his Objection of a *Popedom* being unavoidable from the Episcopal Constitution of Church-Government, and the necessity of having an external Head, and Principle of Union and Communion in every Church, it needs no Answer, the Argument being contrary to the Aristocratical Constitution of the *Catholick Church*, as well as to matter of fact, and stands confuted by the consentient Testimony and Practice, not only of the Churches of *Great Britain*, but of the *Greek*, and *Oriental Churches*, and all the Members of them, as any Man may soon see, who will read *Nilus Thessalonicensis*, *Barlaam the Greek Monk*, and *Nectarius Patriarch of Hierusalem*, and ' many

---

ut facta est. Alioquin enim, inquit, non res geste scribuntur, sed mendacia obtruduntur. Quod autem factum sit, non ex philosophiæ promptuariis bauriendum est, sed eorum narratione ac fide — Ita nos ex Evangelistis, & Apostolis, ac sanctis patribus quesiti nostri solutionem, non ex nostro ingenio petere debemus. Procem. lib. 1. de Rep. Ecclesiast.

' See the Reverend Mr. Chishul's Letter, and the end of the Preface to a Book entituled, *Several Letters between Dr. Hickes and a Popish Priest*.

others, and against the Papal Supremacy, and the several Accounts, particularly that excellent one, which Dr. *Tho. Smith* wrote, of the State of the *Greek Church*.

To mention his Calumny upon the *English Clergy* for carrying the Power of the Church as high as the Papists themselves, and assuming a Power to judge for the People, is sufficient for its Confutation. And as he misapply'd some Passages before out of my Lord *Clarendon's* Answer to *Cressy*, and Dr. *Barrow's* Book against the Pope's Supremacy, to the Independency of the Church, as a Society, upon the State; so with equal Malice and Assurance he perverts the Words of Mr. *Chillingworth* against the Infallibility and Tyranny of the Pope, by misapplication to the Church of *England*, tho' he esteems that Great Man's Authority in behalf of the Church of *England* and her Episcopal Government, no more than Straw, or rotten Wood. He cites King *Charles II.* for saying in a comparison of the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, that one seemed to be in earnest, and the other in jest. I have recited this Saying of that Prince, who saw abroad the strictness of Church-Discipline, to give the Friends of our Church occasion to consider, how much she is reproached for want of Discipline, and put those in remembrance of their Duty, who are concerned to restore the Primitive godly Discipline to the Primitive Doctrine, and Government of the Church. After the Saying of K. *Charles II.* he cites a Saying of one he calls a Reverend Divine, which I think fit to recite, to let the World see, that the Church of *England*, like her Saviour, hath *Judas's* among her Priests, Wolves in Sheeps Clothing, *Arians*, *Socinians*, and other sorts of *Large Souls* among her Clergy, who are not only free Thinkers, but free Speakers, as the following Words shew: *The English Priestcraft* (said that Reverend Divine) *is the courtest that*  
*I ever*



*I ever saw : The Romish is fine, and hath made a delicate Book of Father Paul's Trent History ; theirs is the Depths of Satan, and ours is his Shallows. This Reverend Divine, I doubt not, but was such a one as the Author of the Principles of the Protestant Religion explain'd, in a Letter to a Lady ; a Divine utterly unworthy of that Name, and to minister in holy Places, and Things, but altogether worthy of our Author's Acquaintance, and to be adorned by him, for both write the same Blasphemies, and both alike endeavour the destruction of the Christian Priesthood, and Church. <sup>2</sup> In the Conclusion of his Book he promises the World another, in which he saith, if he may be allowed to be a competent Judge, the Reader will find a full Answer to all the Arguments drawn from Scriptures, as well as Reason, for the Independent Power of the Clergy. Here he hangs out his Flag of Defiance to the Clergy, and let them look to themselves. He is, in his own Opinion, and I suppose that of his Club, their invincible Champion against Priesthood. However, let me say again of this unanswerable full Answer, che venga, let it come, and fear it not : For as God hath hitherto rais'd up Davids from among his despised Servants of the Clergy, to encounter and conquer these Men of Gath ; so I hope a Spirit of Fortitude will still come from him upon others of them, to go out and fight with them, tho' they defy us, and as it were threaten to give our Flesh unto the Fowls of the Air, and to the Beasts of the Field. Will you hear the words of their Challenge from him ? Nor <sup>3</sup> can those, saith he, speaking of himself, who differ from him, have any just reason to be dissatisfied for his giving them an Opportunity to expose, and baffle all the contrary Arguments, since if they have Truth on their side, nothing can do their Cause a greater kindness, than mustering up those Rea-*

*sons which oppose it.* Is not this *Bravado* of our Author something like that of the *Philistine*, who cried out unto the Armies of *Israel*, and said, *Chuse you a man for you, and let him come and fight with me; I defie the armies of Israel, give me a man that we may fight together?*<sup>b</sup> He boasts what Obligations the World hath to him for defendiag the natural Rights of Mankind (which we shall see how he'll maintain against the *Rehearsal*) as a Man, and as a Christian, for striking at the Root of *Antichristian Priestcraft*. Thus, if they were alive, might *Hobbes*, and *Blunt*, and many other Sons of *Belial*, brag; and thus may all the Authors cited in the *Ax* laid to the root of *Christianity*, boast of their Merits for freeing Men and Christians from the Yoke. 'He saith, he hopes the Laity will take him into their Protection, for his Love to Truth, and Zeal for the Church by Law establish'd: Yes, for the Love and Zeal he hath shewed to Truth and her, in writing against her Episcopal Government, in depraving and profaning her holy Offices, in exposing her Priests, and abusing the Christian Priesthood, and deriving all her Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Power from the Magistrate, and in asserting her to tyrannize over the Consciences of Men as much, tho' not with so good a Grace, as the Church of *Rome*.

If this be Love for Truth, and Zeal, and Merit for the Church of *England*, indeed he deserves not only Protection from the Laity, but Praise and Honour from the Clergy, even as much Praise, and Honour, as another Gentleman of the Laity truly deserves from them, who is the Reverse to him, in<sup>a</sup> his Writings about the Church, and Priesthood,

---

<sup>b</sup> Ibid.

<sup>c</sup> P. 115.

<sup>d</sup> A Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England with Collects, and Prayers for each Solemnity. 4th. Edit. By Robert Nelson.

even as much Reverse to him and *his* Writings, I had almost said, as Good it self is to Evil, or a good to an evil Angel. But then it follows, if *I be so unhappy as to fall under the Displeasure of some Ecclesiasticks, even of the national Church, for striking at their Great Diana*, meaning the Distinction of the Church from the State. What fall under the Displeasure of the *national Church* for his Zeal for the *Church established by Law*? Are these two different Churches? Can he deserve well of the one, and fall under the Displeasure of the other? This is Paradox and Riddle, which I leave him to explain, and to tell me, which Clergy it is, the Clergy of the *national Church*, or of the *Church established by Law*, which in the next words he tells the *Laity are their mortal Enemies, who claim an absolute uncontrollable Power over their Minds, and by consequence over their Persons, and Estates.*

I have now done with the *Rights*, and the Author of it, but must tell my Reader, that I have not said all that I might upon his Book. For I might have noted more of his Contradictions, of which take an Example or two, p. 5. He saith, *if the Father by the Law of Nature had absolute Power over the Son, he could not be deprived of it*, and yet p. 10. he saith, *that the Power which every Man hath by the Law of Nature may be transferred by him to the Magistrate.* In p. 14, 15. All Men in judging for themselves in religious Matters, and all religious Assemblies, even Clubs and Meetings for Pleasure must be *Independent* of the Magistrate, but the *Independency* of the Priesthood thro' his whole Book is an intollerable Grievance. In some places he writes as if Persecution were wholly owing to the claim of an independent Power, and yet he asserts that the Apostles, and first Bishops (who were most persecuted) claimed no such Power, p. 190. he saith, the Laity can have no Motive, or Temptation to abuse, and corrupt

rupt Religion, and yet the Reader will find, he impeaches the Clergy for servilely complying with Princes, who have for their Interest corrupted Religion, p. 263. He saith no Heathens were ever so stupid, as to entertain such a monstrous Contradiction, as independent Powers, and yet, p. 43, 98. Excommunication among Christians, the chief Branch of the independent Power was derived from Heathens, who governed all things by virtue of it, and Kings were only their Ministers to execute their Sentences, p. 265. *Constantine* was entirely governed by the Bishops, but p. 197, 201. he governs and manages them. Also p. 118. he saith, there were no Feuds and Animosities among the Heathens upon the account of Religion, and p. 260. that the Heathens never persecuted one another upon that account, both which Assertions are notoriously false, as can be made appear from the Greek and Latin Historians. I have but noted few of the most odious Names and Characters he hath given the Clergy, because it was tedious to collect them: \* as *Spiritual Makebates, Baretters, Boutefeus, and Incendiaries, who make Churches serve to worse purposes, than Bear-Gardens.* I have passed over all his tragical, and fallacious Representations of the independent Power, as the Occasion of all Mischiefs to human Societies, as of Wars, Massacres, Murders, Persecutions, &c. in which way of arguing he may impeach not only the Scriptures, and the whole Christian Religion, as well as that part of it, but our Lord himself, who foreseeing what Divisions his Doctrine would occasion in the World thro' the Unbelief, and Wickedness of Men, said, *think not that I am come to send Peace on Earth, I came not to send Peace but a Sword, to set a Man at variance against his Father, and the Daughter against her Mother,* and so had his infinite Wisdom thought



fit, he might have added, *the Wife against her Husband, the Servant against his Master, and the Subject against his Prince.* Nay in this way of arguing he might arraign the Wisdom, and Goodness of God, for not making Man infallible, impeccable, and immutably good, which really is the *Occasion* of all the Mischiefs to human Societies, and the Misery of Mankind. There is nothing so good, but through the Corruption, and Abuse of Men, may be the *Occasion*, or *accidental* Cause of Evil. No one Doctrine, I believe, in the whole System of Christianity, which hath not *occasioned* Feuds, and Differences in the World from the same *accidental Cause*, as well as that of the independent Power, and more particularly, not only from the Unbelief of Pagan, but from the Ambition, and mere worldly Politicks of Sovereign Christian Princes, and States, or their being misled into Heresies, or Schisms, which I could shew by numerous Instances against our Author from the Histories of the Church.

I might also have shew'd him the falseness of his Assertion, *that our Princes can no more judge in Person, than exercise the Ecclesiastical Function*, from *Bracton* lib. ii. cap. ix, x. fol. 107, 108. which I desire him, as well as the Reader to consult. I have shew'd in *my Dissertation of the use of the ancient Septentrional Literature*, that our Saxon Kings have judged in Person, and he may find a *placitum* in the time of the Conqueror *Willielmo Rege tenente curiam.* in cart. Antiq. E. B. in the Tower, n. 1. In the *Cotton-Library.* Julius D. 6. he may find another mentioned in the time of Edward the Confessor. *Sedente eo pro Tribunali Die Festo in Aula Regia.* Thus the King upon Appeals made into Chancery from the Court-Military often recites, that because he could not be personally present, he therefore constitutes Delegates, *pat. 51. Ed. 3. m. 17. dors. and 36 dors.* There are also Instances of the King's determining Causes

in Person, as pat: 13. R. 2. m. 8. in the Case of *Scroop and Grovesnor*, printed by *Pryn* on the 4<sup>th</sup> Institutes, p. 62. As also in that of *Grey and Hastings*, pat. 1. H. 5. pl. 1. m. 30. And I perceive by the Specimen of Mr. *Madoxo's* History, and Antiquities of the Exchequer, there will be many more Instances of our King's administering Justice in Person to their Subjects. In Answer to his Question *Præface* p. xi. how could the Parliament, if the Convocation had a Divine Right to make Ecclesiastical Laws, enable both Hen. VIII. and Edw. VI. to authorize 32 Persons, half of them Lay-men, to establish all such Ecclesiastical Laws, as should be thought by the King and them convenient, &c? In Answer, I say, to this Question, and all he saith upon it, I thought to have shew'd out of Dr. *Atterbury's* 2<sup>d</sup> Edition of the *Rights and Powers of an English Convocation*, that from many other Instances of the like nature it is highly probable, that those Acts had their first Rise and Original in the Convocation. I cannot transcribe those excellent Remarks, of which I believe the Author of the *Rights* is not ignorant, but am forced to refer the Reader to the Book it self, from p. 179, to p. 206, being cut short very much against my Will. In particular I desire my Reader to consult the whole Passage in Dr. *Fuller's* Church-History, whereof the Doctor cites part, p. 180: and then he may guess, why the Author of the *Rights*, who is now known, would take no Notice of that Book, which would have led his Reader to so good an answer not only to himself, but the most malicious Objection of the Papists against the Church of England, which he has made so much use of in other Terms, viz. that we have a Parliament-Religion, a Parliament-Faith, a Parliament-Gospel; Parliament-Bishops, and a Parliament-Church. It was good Po-

licy in a Man, who turned, or was turning *Papist* in the last of those two, which he now calls the *persecuting Reigns*, to conceal from whom he borrowed that way of arguing from Acts of Parliament against the Church of *England*, and the independent Power, to which she hath an indefeasable Title, and Right, as a *Member of the Catholick Church*. I also thought to have shew'd how <sup>a</sup> his Notion of *natural Freedom*, and *founding all Government in consent of Parties* contrary to the Laws, and Practice of all Nations, the <sup>b</sup> Laws of the *Theocracy* it self not excepted, and the Scriptures of the <sup>c</sup> New Testament, makes Slavery, Villanage, and all purely despotical Governments, where the People are the *Princes Property*, inhuman, unnatural, and unlawful, but I am confined, and must not transgress my Bounds.

I must also tell my Reader, that Variety of matter, and pursuit of Thoughts have made me forget some things. I forgot to name the answers written to the Bishop of *Sarum's* Exposition on the 23<sup>d</sup> Article, to which I presumed to say; I thought his Lordship indebted for a just, and full Reply; the first is intituled, *A<sup>k</sup> Vindication of the 23<sup>d</sup> Article of the Church from a late Exposition, &c.* The other is in the 202<sup>d</sup> Page of a Book intituled, *The Reasonableness of a Toleration enquired into, &c.* And I am glad of this Opportunity to recommend so excellent a Book unto the World.

Thus much I thought my self obliged to write in answer to the Book of the *Rights*: without premising a confutation of which, the two following Disser-

---

<sup>a</sup> Introduction. <sup>b</sup> *Exod.* xxi. 5, 6, 7. *Levit.* xxv. 44, 45, 46.

<sup>c</sup> *1 Tim.* vi. 1. *1 Pet.* ii. 18, 19, 20, 21. *Eph.* vi. 5. *Col.* iii. 21. *Tit.* ii. 9. *1 Cor.* vii. 21. *Philemon* xv. 16.

<sup>k</sup> London Printed for Thomas Bennet at the Half Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard. 1702.

<sup>l</sup> London, Printed in the Year 1705.

ccclvi     *A Prefatory Discourse*

tations, which were in the Prefs, when that Book was first published, could not, I thought, with any good grace, or assurance make their entrance into the World. I am satisfied there is nothing in that Book of any seeming force, or contrary to the Doctrines I have delivered in them, but what I have fairly, and fully answered without *Fallacies and Sophisms*, with which that Book almost in every Page abounds. But I have manifestly solved them all, at least the chiefest of them, and also shew'd that the whole of it is nothing but *bis cocta crambe*, or a mere *Rhapsody* of Cavils, and Calumnies, pick'd and collected out of the vilest Writers, not only against the *Church of England*, but against the *Catholick Church*, at which this Enemy of Christianity, and of the Christian Priesthood strikes through her sides. I say against the *Church of England*, whose very Misfortunes, which she could not prevent, this Penman of the *Deists* imputes to her as Crimes; against the *Church of England*, whose ruin this Satanical Sect of Men seek above all other Churches, because she is so like the Primitive Church, and therefore in this Miscellaneous Book of the *Rights*, they have drawn up in Battel-array against her, not only the Arguments of Popish Writers, but of the *Epicureans* out of *Spinoza*, the Apostate Jew's Works, to disaffect Men against all Priests, and all Revealed Religion; against the *Old*, as well as the *New* Testament, and bring them to an utter Contempt, and Disbelief of *Moses*, and Jesus Christ. There is nothing relating to the Church, and her Constitution, which their Malice hath left unattack'd: her truly Catholick Doctrine; her Divine Authority; her Apostolical Mission; her Spiritual Discipline, or Power of Censures; her Priesthood; her Holy Sacraments; her Revenues, or rather the poor remainder of them; her Primitive Polity, and Government by Bishops; her Independency on the  
Powers



Powers of the World, or whatsoever else belongs to her as a *Society*, or a *Sett*. All this have they done in this one *Master-piece* of their Antichristian Heresy, which before it was put to the Press passed through many of their Hands to *patch* it up as neatly as they could, together, and give it all the Advantages, that Wit, and Malice could give it, to make it acceptable to a wicked World. In particular it was perused by Mr. *Lock* before he died, as the great Disperser, and Preconizer of it at home; and abroad, confessed to one of my Friends. But; God be thanked, the Antidotes have prevailed against the Poison of it among all, who have had the Ingenuity impartially to read the Answers to it: and as for those, who will not read them at all, or as they should with Patience, and Impartiality, I may say in allusion to the Apostle, if our Church; and its Gospel, and Evangelical Constitution, and Priesthood are hid, they are only hid to those, who are lost; to those who have Ears, and will not hear; Eyes and will not see; and whose Hearts are hardened in Scepticism, or perfect Unbelief.

It hath been a great Satisfaction, and Comfort to me, and so will be in my last moments, that these Unbelievers have so persecuted me in particular among other more worthy Clergy-men since the first Edition of this Work. I look upon all their Lies, and Libels upon me, as so many marks of Honour, and I hope I may presume to say without Arrogance, or Vanity, that their Malice against me in their Pamphlets, proceeds from the sense they have of the harm I have done them in this Prefatory Answer, and other Discourses lately published against them; and I praise Almighty God, who hath counted me worthy to be hated by them, and those wicked Spirits; whose Instruments they are, and by whom upon Christian Principles I doubt not but they are inspired.

cclviii      *A Prefatory Discourse*

In what I have written of the *Communion-Office*, I have spoken in behalf of the ancient Order of using the Prayer of Oblation in or immediately upon the Prayer of Consecration, and to prevent any Mistakes, or any just Objection, which may be made against me upon that account, I beg leave to present the Reader with the Words of one of the greatest Divines, and Prelates, that this Church, or perhaps any other, ever had; who in spite of Calumny, will always be glorious in his Martyrdom and Memory; I mean Archbishop *Land*, in his <sup>m</sup> Reply to the Charge of the *Scotish Commissioners*: *To invert the Order of some Prayers in the Communion, or any other part of the Service, doth neither pervert the Prayers, nor corrupt the Worship of God. — And tho' I shall not find fault with the Order of the Prayers, as they stand in the Communion-Book of England (for God be thanked 'tis well) yet if a Comparison must be made, I do think the Order of the Prayers, as they now stand in the Scotish Liturgy, to be the better, and more agreeable to the Use in the Primitive Church; and I believe they who are Learned will acknowledge it. And whenever the Liturgy comes to be revised in Convocation, I cannot but also wish, that the Prayer of Oblation may be restored to its ancient place, as in the Offices in the Appendix.* And since I have taken some pains in the following Letters, to shew that Christian Presbyters are proper Priests, appointed by God to bless the People, I cannot also forbear wishing, not only that the <sup>n</sup> *Apostolical Benediction* at the End of the Morning and Evening Services, were put in the Apostolick Form, to be pronounced standing by the Priest, but also that some other Prayers might by addition, or alteration, be appointed, which the Priest *alone* should put up for

---

<sup>m</sup> History of the Troubles and Trial of Archbishop *Land*, p. 115.  
<sup>n</sup> 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

the People, as in the ancient Liturgies of the Church.

And whereas I have written for the strict Observation of the *restored Rubrick*, which enjoins the Priest to place the Bread, and Wine upon the Holy Table immediately after the Alms of the People are humbly presented, and set upon it, and for the more convenient Practice of that Rubrick have after the ancient manner recommended the Use of a PROTHESIS, or another Table from whence he may fetch them, or they may be brought to him: I desire a liberty here to observe, that in Churches, where there are *Vestries*, the Tables therein are very proper for that purpose, and that in Churches where there are none, such Tables may be set up in any Side-Ile on either side of the Chancel; and where there are no such Side-Iles, there cannot want other convenient Places, wherein to set such necessary Boards; necessary, I say, for the Observation of that Rubrick, the general neglect whereof I cannot but bemoan; nor can I imagine with what Conscience those of the Clergy, who know it, can neglect it more than any other Rubrick, or how any of them can ridicule the Observation of it, as I am assured one dignified Priest did, or presume as ° another with uncommon *Latitude* hath had the Confidence to do since the last Edition of this Book, not only to *excuse* the neglect of it, as a *Punctilio*, but to assert that as such it is *vacated* by the universal Practice of the Church, even of the Bishops themselves. It was high time for Mr. Sharp to tax the Irregularities of such *Libertines* among the Clergy, who think themselves free to practise, or not practise the Orders of the Church by halves, or by wholes, as they please. But at this rate a Church

---

\* Dr. Hancock in his Answer to some things contained in Dr. Hickey's Christian Priesthood, p. 139, 140.

of such Priests, or where there is a majority of such Priests, as the Doctor, and that Bishop, who supervised his Book, may by their evil Practice *vacate* not only what *Rubricks*, but what *Canons* they please, the XXXVI<sup>th</sup> not excepted, by Subscription to which all Clergy-men admitted to Cures oblige themselves to observe that Form in ministering Prayers, and Sacraments, which the Liturgy prescribes; and if any of them who have so subscribed, and presume to prevaricate after Subscription in omitting to observe the Form, Rites, and Ceremonies enjoined to be observed in the Book of Common-Prayer, he is first to be suspended by the XXXVIII<sup>th</sup> Canon; and if he doth not mend his Practice within a month after, he is to be deprived. But seeing these loose, and treacherous sort of Priests, who have caused so much mischief to the Church, notwithstanding the Authority and Obligation of her Canons to the contrary, assume to themselves a Liberty of dispensing with, and making her Injunctions void; I must put them in remembrance, however they are dignified or distinguished, of the <sup>P</sup> *Act of Uniformity of publick Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, &c.* that if they do not think themselves obliged for *Conscience-sake* strictly to obey the Church in observing her Orders, they may know they are bound to do it for *Wrath* by the said ACT. And to convince Dr. Hancock, and such Priests as he, be they of the higher or lower Order, that it is not in their Power to *vacate* the Rubricks of the Church, or vary from the *Order, Manner, or Form* in which she hath appointed the Sacraments to be administered, I must ask his leave to tell him a short, but true Story for his Edification. Such another Parish-Priest as he, in ministering the Holy Communion,



had for several Years neglected to observe the Rubrick for the *Offertory*, and receiving the Alms of the People, as that Rubrick appoints, to the just Offence of some of his Flock; one of which a worthy Person, and Man of Note in his Parish, first desired, and then privately admonished him, to observe that Rubrick; but he persisting in the irregular neglect thereof, the good Man went where there was Authority Ecclesiastical to complain of him; but there (*O Tempora!*) he was told to the same purpose as the Doctor writes, that it was a thing of little moment, for which he gave himself so much trouble, a *Punctilio* of a Rubrick, and that they would not have him make himself uneasy for such small matters, it being of no great importance whether the People gave their Alms before, or after the Sacrament was administered. But he, as a truly affectionate Son of the Church, being as sensible of his own, as of his Minister's Duty, and not finding redress, where it was to be expected, bethought himself of the *Act* of *Uniformity*, and thereupon went to his Minister, and shew'd him the *Act*, and told him plainly if he once more omitted the *Offertory*, he would bring an Information against him upon that *Act* in the *Crown-Office*. After this kind, and seasonable warning, the Priest thought it convenient to observe the long neglected Rubrick, and continued to observe it ever since without deviation; and if any of Dr. *Hancock's Church-Wardens*, or Parishioners would please to proceed in like prudent, and charitable manner with him for omitting the next Rubrick, which enjoins him after the *Offertory* to set the Bread, and Wine upon the Lord's Table, he would then begin to think it was more than a *Punctilio*, and not in his Power, and the Power of the irregular Clergy, though never so many, or great, to *vacate* the Observation of it by their sinful and scandalous neglect, as he with a peculiar

cular confidence, and sort of Casuistry not common among his Brethren, presumes upon what Principle I know not, to affirm.

I designed also, in pursuance and consequence of what I have written about the Christian Priesthood, to address my self in most humble manner to the Clergy, to put them in remembrance of their Office, as *Priests*, and to study to adorn it, as much at least as they generally do their Office, as *Preachers*; and to that end, among other Theories belonging to our Profession, to study rightly to understand the Powers, and Privileges of the Priesthood, and what they are to practise as such, and not to neglect their Sacerdotal Talents, or lay them up, as it were in a Napkin, and suffer them to go farther into desuetude, to the dishonour of their Lord and Master, the great prejudice of the Priestly part of their Ministry, and the farther decay of that Reverence, which the ancient Christians shew'd to their Ministers, as *Priests*. We should study to be *skilful Confessaries*, and Physicians of Souls as well as good Preachers, to know when and how to use the Power of remitting and retaining Sins, of blessing the People, and of administering the *Christian Sacrifice* aright. These things God expects indispensably from us, as well as Preaching; and of which let me say to those, who as it were devote themselves to the one, and neglect the other, *these things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.* That of the two, requires our Care at least as much as *this*, tho' it is now so much disused, chiefly I fear by the want of *Penitential Canons*, which every Bishop of any Country may supply in his own Diocess, till the whole College can make penitential Canons for the Diocesses of the National Church. I also thought to have made a *Paranesis* to the Candidates of the Priesthood, and the younger Clergy, not to begin their Studies in Divinity at the wrong end, especially with *Dutch Systems*, such

as *Episcopius*, *Limborch*, or any of our Transcribers from them, but to study the Apostolical Learning in a diligent perusal of the Greek Testament, which ought to be carefully read two, or three times over, and then to proceed to the diligent reading of the *Apostolick Fathers*, and after reading them to read all the Fathers, and Provincial Councils to the first general Council of *Nice*, and the Ecclesiastical Histories of *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*. Did Students of Divinity take this Method in their Studies, the Church would not suffer by so many *Latitudinarians* among her Divines, nor should we have so many strange, and dangerous Assertions preached, and printed, as were it not to reflect, I could shew in great plenty have been published by Divines of great Parts, and otherwise learned, I mean in Learning *external* to their Profession, but not in the ancient Ecclesiastical Learning, which should be first studied by all Clergy-men, that being well versed in their own Originals, they may not take such liberties of thinking, and writing, or become such *Indifferents*, as some are, and run into many Mistakes. But then if fatal want of Books in the learned Languages, or any other hard Circumstances will not allow Students in Divinity to peruse those early, and ancient *Originals*, then the next best thing they can do, will be to read such Orthodox Divines of our own Church as fetched their Divinity from those Fountains: I mean such as *Jewell*, *Poinet*, *Mede*, *Downam*, *Laud*, *Montague*, *Hammond*, *Pearson*, *Thorndike*, *Bull*, *Beveridge*, &c. whose Writings will instruct and fix them in true Principles, and preserve them from that *Latitude* otherwise called *Largeness of Mind*, which hath corrupted Divinity to such a deplorable degree, and set Men free from the chief Doctrines, and Principles of Christianity, which relate to the Church, as a *Society*, or as a *Sect*.

Before I conclude, to acquit my self from the seeming Imputation of *Tautology* in my Discourse of *the Christian Priesthood*, I must advertise my Reader that I have been forced to produce some Testimonies, and Authorities out of the Fathers several times, just as the same Witnesses are usually examined again, and again in judicial Trials, not to the same, but several different Points. Thus he will find the same Testimony cited in one place barely to prove the *Christian Sacrifice*, and it may be in another to shew, that *the Oblation of the Elements* was such a special part of the Eucharistical Worship, that ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑ, and OBLATIO were singly used to signify the Holy Communion, and ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΙΝ, and OFFERRE to celebrate the same, and perhaps in a third to shew in what sense the Fathers understood such or such a Text. So he may find the same Authorities produced in one place to prove the Oblation of the Sacramental Bread, and Cup to God the Father, and in another to prove the ΕΠΙΚΛΗΣΙΝ, or Prayer unto him to send down his Holy Spirit upon the *Oblations*, and perhaps in a third to shew that Tradition of the Ancients, who taught that Christ himself in the Institution of that Holy Sacrament offered the Bread, and Wine to his Father, and thereby taught his Disciples to do the same. I must also entreat the learned Reader not to omit the Testimonies I have in this Answer to *the Rights*, or in the following Discourses cited in the Margin, which generally are as considerable as any in the Text, and had been put there, could it have been conveniently done without wearying the greater part of Readers, and clogging it too much.

I must also ask my Readers leave to take notice of a Reflection, in which I have reason to think I am particularly pointed at for my way of writing this Answer to the *Rights*. The Words of the Reflection



tion are these which follow divided into several Paragraphs with as many Replies. <sup>9</sup> *I do not make it my business to cry out of the Times.* Nor have I made it mine in this Answer, or elsewhere: to note the *crying Sins* of the Times is not to *cry out* of them, especially to note them with all the Seriousness that becomes a Christian, and Soberness, and Gravity, that becomes a Christian Priest. What the Apostle saith of Men is justly applicable to Times. The Sins of some Times are so open as well as great and so notorious, and glaring, as well as grievous, as precedently to any proof to bring them under the just Censure, and Animadversion of every good Christian; and to every good Christian, and Christian Priest, even to as many of his own Clergy as desired his *Lordship* to print his Charge, I dare appeal against him, whether in this Answer to the *Rights*, I have taken notice of these licentious Times in any other manner, than they deserve, or what becomes my Character, as a Priest, or what deserves the Name of Exclamation in the Sense his *Lordship* means by *crying out*. "His *Lordship* confesses, that "the Design of the Writer of the *Rights* was apparently wicked, levelled against all the Christian Religion, and not at all framed to promote any thing, that was honest, and good. In 'another place, "that his Book destroys even the Name and "Notion of the Church, and deserves to be mentioned with the utmost abhorrence, and that this "Age hath produced several such; and could it then deserve Censure to tax Liberties allowed in such an Age to print such Books, which no other Christian Nation Reformed, or Unreformed would allow? Which (Times) will sooner mend

---

<sup>9</sup> Bishop Trimmell's Address to his Clergy before his Charge delivered to them at the Visitation of his Diocese in the Year 1709.

Charge, p. 4.

f. P. 3.

ccclxvi      *A Prefatory Discourse*

by a quiet doing our Duty, than by inveighing against them. Here the Phrase is only varied, *inveighing* instead of *crying out*; and I would pray his Lordship to consider, if St. Ignatius, Cyprian, Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, or to name but one Presbyter, Tertullian were now living among us, whether their Zeal for Christ, and his Church, and to preserve their Flocks from the Wolves, would not have obliged them to cry out *O Tempora!* and even *inveigh* against the *Gallionism* of the Age: Nay in all Humility I pray his Lordship seriously to consider, whether the Apostles, had any of them lived in our Nation, and Times, would not have cried out against the Spiritual Governours in particular, and in a very severe manner for not censuring these devoted Enemies of Christ, and his Church; or which is next to nothing, for censuring of them only as *Eli* did his Sons, those Sons of Belial, which though he might call it a quiet doing of his Duty, yet God accounted it no better, than not doing it at all. And I would also beseech his Lordship to consider what the Spirit said unto the Churches of Pergamus, and Thyatira, and by them to the Church of England, for suffering Antichristian Men who fill the World with worse Doctrines, than those of Balaam, or the Nicolaitans, and to seduce her Sons, and Daughters from believing any Revealed Religion to Scepticism, or utter Unbelief. When Men are so affected at the Iniquities they at any time see, as to take the most proper course to have them removed, they give proof of their being religious, and wise, and can hardly fail of curing some at least of the Evils they find. Here I agree with his Lordship. But then I must say to take no course at all, or to take one, that is no better than none, to remove any Evils, is not to take the most proper course, nor of giving Proofs of being religious, or wise. And as to the Evils his Lordship means, I dare be bold to say, had Grindal, or Whitgift, or Bancroft,

*Bancroft, or Laud* been now living, they would not have taken the course, which I suppose his Lordship thinks most proper, but some other to silence those Enemies of all Revealed Religion: they would have exercised their own Spiritual Authority against them by the highest Censures in, and out of Convocation, and with Prayers, and had it been needful with Tears also supplicated the secular Powers for God's, and his Christ's sake, and every thing that was sacred in the Christian Religion to curb their Insolence, and put some stop to their Blasphemies, by doing of which with, or without Success, they had, I conceive, taken the most proper course, at least to deliver their own Souls. But when such things, which are more, or less the Infelicity of all Times are aggravated to blacken the present, and when that is done, to reproach those, who govern no better, there is as little Justice, as there is Piety, or Wisdom in such kind of Complaints, and they are not like to mend the condition of things. This way of Apology will serve to excuse any Man, as well, as any Times: But when such things (may the worst of Men say) which more, or less are the Infirmities of all Men, are aggravated to blacken us, and when that is done to reproach us for living no better, there is as little Justice, as there is Piety, or Wisdom in such kind of Complaints, and they are not like to mend us. Thus hath his Lordship made an Apology for the worst of Men, or People as well, as for the worst of Times, which can be supposed to happen; and according to this way of apologizing for Times, there can be none so bad, wherein the Ministers of Christ, those Watchmen of Israel, ought to lift up their Voices like Trumpets, or complain, and cry out against the Sins of any Times, be they never so great. This Apology would have served for the Times of the Great Rebellion, and even to have extenuated the Iniquities of those Times, of which both a Prophet, and an Apostle said,

## cclxviii    *A Prefatory Discourse*

said, *there is none righteous no not one.* *There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.* *They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable, there is none that doth good no not one.* I might challenge his *Lordship* to shew, that in my Complaints of the Times, I have used any such *Hyperboles*, or other Figures of Aggravation, though if I had, I could justify my self by Authorities both human and divine. Might it justly be said of *Livy* for his Complaint in the <sup>r</sup> Margin, that he *blackened the Times*, in which he lived, and reproached those who governed no better. Or will his *Lordship* say, that *SALVIAN* *blackened the Times* he lived in, when he described the grievous Sins of them, one of which was not to punish, but tolerate particular Crimes. To *blacken* by a Metaphor in our Language signifies to defame Men, or Times unjustly, without cause, or spitefully to aggravate common Failings, or Faults of a lower degree into great Sins. This his *Lordship* suggests as if I had done it, though in effect I have said no more of the Times, than his *Lordship* hath done in his <sup>n</sup> Charge, where he acknowledges the liberty, with which too many treat the Christian Religion in way of Contempt, would incline one to believe, there was less of the sense of it upon Mens minds, than hath formerly been. Here his *Lordship* complains of the liberty which too many take; and I only bewailed the liberty, which those too many are allowed to take; and, as I thought my Christian and Priestly Duty obliged me, set it forth upon Scripture-Principles, as a crying Sin. But then his *Lordship* to qualify what he had said of the Times, immediately subjoins, that if we consider

---

<sup>r</sup> — *Labente deinde paulatim Disciplina, velut desidentes primos sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sunt, tum ire coeperint precipites, donec ad hæc Tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra, nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est.*



the many present Works of Piety, particularly those for the Education of Children, we cannot but hope that there is a Spirit of true Christianity moving among us, and such an one as will be too strong for all the despicable Attempts of profane, and Atheistical Men. His Lordship must give me leave to observe, that excepting some very few Times and Places, such as the old World, and Sodom, there were scarce any so wicked, in which a true Spirit of Religion did not move among a considerable number of good Men. Several thousands such there were in the little Kingdom of Israel in the time of Ahab, and even when they were carried into Captivity; but neither their Prayers, nor their Tears could prevail with God, not to judge the Nation for the provoking Sins of it. And his Lordship knows who said, and of what Times he said it, that *except the Lord of Hosts had left unto us a small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and like unto Gomorrah*. I mightily differ from his Lordship in thinking the Attempts of *Atheists*, and *Deists* despicable, for, I think, I could shew, that they are not to be despised. They are *Confederate* at home, and have *Allies* abroad. They have slain their thousands, and ten thousands; but I must not insist upon this unhappy, and nice Subject, lest I should seem to *blacken the Times*, and reproach those, who govern no better, and be told for so doing that I was neither religious, nor wise, nor like to mend the condition of things. I was going to put his Lordship in remembrance of *Priestcraft in Perfection*, to which, I heard he had some thoughts of making an Answer, and to ask him, if upon reading of it, he did not cry out, *O TEMPORA!* but I must remember how I am confined, and therefore conclude with the Words of \* *Hugo Floriacensis*, in the Prologue to his Book of the *Sacerdotal Dignity*: *Veruntamen precor eos per eorum magnificentiam, ne eis sordescat meum*

---

\* Baluzii Miscellan. lib. iv. p. 11.

*rusticum eloquium, sed malint veros, quam disertos audire sermones; ceterum scio quia tutius veritas auditur, quam predicatur. Unde nunc deprecor omnes venerabiles Præfules, & reliquos sanctæ Ecclesiæ Prælatos & Clericos simul sensatos, qui hac lecturi sunt, ne me præsumptorem judicent, aut temerarium, quasi ego eos in cathedris sedentes, & Divina philosophia ætana scientes superbe coner instruere. Non quaso, ita existiment, sed hac pie & aquanimiter legant, atque suscipiant. Opto enim & ut ipsi omnes venerabiles Patres, & Domini mei cotidie proficiant in Christo Jesu Domino nostro, & ut Ecclesia sancta corpus eorum temporibus ordine congruo corroboretur, & firmo pacis sedere jugiter perfruatur. Amen.*

**Soli Deo Gloria.**

(1)

---

THE  
**Christian Priesthood**  
ASSERTED.

---

CHAP. I.

REVEREND SIR,

I Thank you for putting me in mind of what you think will be objected against the fourth Proposition in my first Letter. You grant I have sufficiently proved from Scripture that the Christian Church by its Constitution is a Royal or Regal Priesthood, or Sacerdotal Kingdom; but that I have not proved from it, that the Ministers of the Church are Priests, which you say will be brought as an Objection by some Men against the second Reason which I give, why the Church is call'd a Royal or Regal Priesthood, *to wit*, because the Royal Priest or Sacerdotal King of it, Christ Jesus, hath committed the Government and Administration of his Kingdom to Priests. You tell me those Men will be sure to observe against me, that the Ministers of Christ in the whole New Testament are not once call'd *Priests*, nor their Ministry *Priesthood*; but that those Names or Titles grew in to Use among the Ecclesiastical Writers after the times in which the Scriptures were written. This,

## 2 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Sir, you say, is expressly affirm'd by <sup>a</sup> Chemnitius, in the following Words. *In the Writings of the New Testament, the Name of Priest and Priesthood is never given to the Ministry of the Gospel, but the Custom of calling the Ministry Priesthood, and the Ministers Priests, came to prevail from the use of those Names in Ecclesiastical Writers.* And that Bishops are proper Priests, you say is affirmed by a <sup>b</sup> late Writer, to be absolutely rejected by the whole Protestant Communion. This Writer seconds himself with great Assurance in <sup>c</sup> another Book, where he tells us, that when the Author of *The Second Defence of the Church of England*, deny'd Bishops to be Priests in the proper Sense of the Word, he spake in the Language that hath been current in this Church ever since the Reformation. And for his own part, he saith, he cannot conceive why the Author of the *Regale and Pontificat* asserted a proper Priesthood, unless it were to make way for a proper Sacrifice, and if that be the reason, (saith he, very ignorantly as well, as maliciously) it is easie to guess what Men would be at. Indeed, it is easie to guess from whom he borrow'd this Phrase, and at his ill meaning in it, which doth not only reflect, as he intended, upon that learned Writer, but on the ancient Fathers and Councils, who thought the Holy Eucharist a proper Sacrifice, and upon our first Reformers; as may be seen in our <sup>d</sup> first Liturgy, and upon those <sup>e</sup> learned Bishops in both Kingdoms, who compiled *The Liturgy of the Church of Scotland*, and upon Bishop Andrews,

---

<sup>a</sup> *Examen Concil. Trident. de Sacram. Ordin. Cap. 1. P. 240.*

<sup>b</sup> *Second Defence of the Church of England; from the Charge of Schism and Heresie. P. 8.*

<sup>c</sup> In a Book entituled, *The Regal Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Affairs*, asserted in a Discourse occasion'd by the *Case of the Regale and Pontificat*.

<sup>d</sup> Commonly called the First Book of K. Edward VI.

<sup>e</sup> Archbishop Spotswood, and Archbishop Laud, &c.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 3

Mr. Mede, and some other very learned Men now living, mentioned in the following Discourse. Nay he is so very *self-assured* as to affirm, that *the Priesthood in a proper Sense is not to be proved*; and yet he brings no other Argument for his Assertion, but the single Authority of one Man, Dr. *Outram*, to whom he sends the Author of the *Regale*, as a Scholar to his Master, to learn the *Difference betwixt a proper Priesthood, and the Evangelical Ministry*. And that he might oblige that excellent Writer to hearken to him with all Deference and Submission, as a Disciple, he tells him that *he was as great a Man, as this Church ever had*. He was indeed a learned, and a pious Man, and an Ornament to the Church, and his Learning and Piety make me honour his Memory. Particularly he was well versed in the Hebrew and Rabbinical Learning; but even in that, which was his chief Study and Talent, there were many eminent Men of the Church, who flourished before him, and in his time, whom he would have acknowledged his Superiours, as Mr. *Nic. Fuller*, Dr. *Pocock*, Bp. *Walton*, Dr. *Lightfoot*, not to mention o-

---

<sup>f</sup> *De Sacrificiis lib. 1. cap. 19. §. 4. p. 222. Jam vero quamvis S. Paulus tralatitio loquendi genere, &c.* And now, though St. Paul using a *Metaphorical Kind of Speech*, assumes the Person of a Priest, and although all Christians, upon the account of those spiritual Sacrifices which they daily offer unto God, are sometimes called *Priests*; yet it is to be noted, that no Ministers of the Gospel, of what Order soever, are upon the account of their Office called *Priests* or *High-Priests*. Which, I therefore observe, that you may understand the great Difference betwixt the *Evangelical Ministry*, and the *Aaronical Priesthood*: which chiefly appears in this; that the former is ordained for God in things pertaining to Men, but the latter for Men in things pertaining to God. From whence we may learn this also, that *that* hath chiefly to do with Men, but *this* to do with God: To this we may add, that the *Priesthood of Christ*, and not the *Evangelical Ministry*, succeeds the Jewish Priesthood. So that now there is none but Christ himself, who by Authority derived from God, is a Priest or *High-Priest*, that is, an *Advocate* for Men with God:

T

thers.

#### 4 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

thers. And as for the Knowledge of the Fathers and Councils, which is so requisite for a Divine, I wish he had been as well versed in them, as in *Ben. Maimon.* and *Abarbanel*, and then indeed he might have been as great a Man, as this Author for his own Purpose describes him to have been, even a Star of the first Magnitude in the Firmament of the Church. But, *Sir*, we injure the Memories of such worthy Men, when we stretch their Characters, and make them greater than they were; and therefore, as Writers should take care not to lessen the just worth and greatness of Authors, when they give Testimony against them; so ought they not to magnifie and aggrandize them above what is meet, when they are on their side, especially when they reason only from their Authority, as *your late Writer* in both his Books doth in a point, wherein against the Voice of Antiquity, it did not become him to be so dogmatical, and assured.

But *Grotius* writes on this Subject with more Modesty than this Gentleman; for he, when speaking of the Christian Priesthood, writes thus, *Truly it was a received Custom in the ancient Church to call the Preachers of the Gospel Priests, but there was some reason why Christ and his Apostles abstain'd from that way of speaking, which is sufficient to admonish us, lest we lightly and inconsiderately draw an Argument [about some things mention'd there] from the Levitical Priests to the Ministers of the Gospel, because there is a great Difference of one from the other, in the Function and the Succession of the Persons to it.* Before I proceed to obviate that Objection, I must observe that it makes no great Difference, as to my Undertaking in the first Letter, Whether Bishops be, properly speaking, Priests or not? or whether or no they be so much as Priests in an improper Sense; that is,

---

<sup>1</sup> *De Imperio Sum. Potest. Cap. xi. 5.*

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 5

whether they are Priests at all or no? For my chief Design there is to shew, that they are Christ's Stewards in his House; his Vicegerents upon Earth in the several Principalities or Dominions of his spiritual Kingdom; and that all Christians as such, Kings and Senates, as well as their People, are Subjects to them as to his Vicegerents, or chief Ministers over the Catholick Church. To prove this is my chief Design in <sup>b</sup> *my Propositions*, and this is true, whether they be admitted to be Priests or no; or whether or no they represent Christ the Antitypal *Melchisedeck* in his double Capacity, and are Servants and Ministers under him in the several Dominions of his spiritual Kingdom, both as High-Priest, and King. You know, *Sir*, the Presbyterians, who do not allow Bishops and Presbyters to be Priests, yet assert the Nature of Christ's spiritual Kingdom, and all the Rights of it to be independent of the Kingdoms of the World; and carry the spiritual Power and Authority of the Presbytery, as his Ministry, to as great a height as I have done that of Bishops; whom agreeably to the consentient Testimony of Ecclesiastical Writers, and Councils, I assert to be *Priests*, and their Authority to be a *Sacerdotal Authority*, and their College in every Christian Province, and in and through the whole World, to be a *Sacerdotal College*. And I am neither afraid nor ashamed to say, that I will adhere to this consentient Authority, and Tradition of the ancient Church, in the best and purest Ages of it; tho' it were rejected, as *your late Writer* falsely asserts, *by the whole Protestant Communion*, or as he should have said, *by all the Protestant Churches*, for they are many and different; and few of them, as the common Adversary observes, are in Communion one with another.

---

<sup>b</sup> The first four of which are printed in the beginning of the *Prefatory Answer*.

## 6 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

II: Having premised this, I proceed, as you advised me, to obviate the Objection which these Men will be apt to make against the Second Reason of my *Fourth Proposition*, Not believing Bishops and Presbyters to be *Priests*, or *proper Priests*, because they are neither call'd *Priests*, nor is their Office or Ministry call'd *Priesthood* in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which hath been also observed by many Learned Men, who yet never doubted but that they were *Priests*. Wherefore, to set my Answer to this Objection in as clear a Light, as I can, I will shew *First*, That it is not a good Argument to prove that the Ministers of the Christian Church are not *Priests*, or their Office not a *Priesthood*, because they are not so called in the New Testament. *Secondly*, I will shew, that tho' the Names of *Priests* and *Priesthood*, as apply'd to the Ministers and Ministry of Christ, are not found in the New Testament, yet the thing signify'd by those Names, is there, and properly belongs to them. And *Thirdly*, I will give you the Reasons, for which learned Men conjecture, they are not called by those Names in the Writings of the New Testament.

III: First, then, I will shew that it is no good Argument to prove the Bishops and Presbyters of the Christian Church not to be *Priests*, or their respective Offices a *Priesthood*, because those Names are not given them in the Scriptures of the New Testament. For there are many things contain'd in the New Testament, which have been taught for Gospel-Truths and Doctrines by the Catholick Church, tho' the Names or Terms by which they are express'd and taught are not to be found there. The Word or Term *Original Sin*, or *Birth-Sin* is

---

IX. Article of Religion. Ministration of Publick Baptism for Infants: dearly beloved for as much as all Men are conceived and born in Sin — IX<sup>th</sup> of the 39 Articles.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 7

not to be found in the whole Bible, and yet because the thing signified by it is there, very few Divines or other Christians doubt of the Doctrine signify'd by it, as it was taught in the time of the *Pelagian* Controversie, and is defined in the ninth Article of our Church. The divine Authority of the New Testament, is and hath been a previous Article of Faith taught and believed in all Churches, and yet there is not one Book in it, which either saith of it self, or of the whole Testament, that it is of *Divine Authority*, or was written by *Divine Inspiration*. So the admitting *Women*, as well as *Men* to the Holy Eucharist hath been the universal Custom and Practice of the Church; and yet no one Book of the New Testament saith in expresse Words, that *Women* were admitted to the Holy Sacrament, indeed no more than that *Infants* were baptized. There are many more Doctrines and Practices which have been taught and profess'd in all Churches and Ages, as <sup>k</sup> common Principles of Christianity; of which we have no expresse mention in the New Testament, nor can find therein the Name or Terms in which they have been taught, and defined by the Catholick Church. The Words *Person* or *Trinity*, or *Trinity in Unity* are not there; ὁμοῦσι<sup>o</sup> or *consubstantial*, as the *Arians* objected, are not there to be found; nor is θεῶν τρεῶν<sup>o</sup> in all the Greek Testament; or is it any where expressely, or in Terms therein taught, that *Jesus Christ* is *very God* and *very Man* in one and the same Person. The like is to be said of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, who as the <sup>l</sup> *Unitarians* object, is not once expressely affirmed to be

---

<sup>k</sup> See Dr. William Beveridge's Proæmium before his *Codex Canonicum Eccles. Primitivæ Vindicat.*

<sup>l</sup> Woltzenii Comment. in *Act. Apost. cap. v. 3.* ut mentireris in Spiritum Sanctum. Bene hoc loco Piscator in Scholiis, Spiritum Sanctum, i. e. Nos Apostolos, in quibus agit Spiritus Sanctus, & quibus

## 8 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

be God in all the Scriptures of the New Testament. The same may be said of the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*, which is there, tho' not under that Name, and also of *Infant-Baptism*; the religious Observation of the *first Day* of the Week, by Christians called the *Lord's Day*, and of the Polity or Government of the Church by Bishops superior to and distinct from Presbyters, which yet was the Form of Government in all Churches, and Ages for almost 1600 Years from the time of the Apostles, tho' it is not in express Words mentioned or described in the Holy Scriptures. So the <sup>m</sup> Doctrine of the *two Sacraments* is not expressly to be found there, nor of the *Eucharist's* being a *real, external, and material Oblation*, tho' the one, as well as the other hath been the constant, and invariable Tradition of the Church, this to the time of the Reformation, and that to this day. So to give an Example of another kind, the Word *Μυσταγωγία* which signifies to teach religious Mysteries and Rites; *Μυσταγωγία* teaching religious Mysteries and Rites; *Μυστες*, <sup>n</sup> *Hieromystes*, *Mystagogus*, *Hierotelestes*, and <sup>o</sup> *Hierophantes*, a Teacher of religious Mysteries and Rites, are not any of them once used in the New Testament; and yet

---

quibus revelat, quæ opus est ad adificationem Ecclesiæ. Metonymia adjuncti. Vers. 4. Non mentitus es hominibus, sed Deo — Simile huic dictum est, Exod. xvi. Ubi postquam Versu 2. Scriptum est Congregationem Israelitarum murmurasse contra Mosem, & contra Aaronem; deinde versu 8. dicitur: Non contra nos murmuraciones vestra, sed contra DOMINUM. Et Num. xx. Postquam dictum est Versu 3. Jurgatum esse populum cum Mose: postea Versu 13. Dicitur ibi tunc jurgatos esse filios Iſr. cum DOMINO, seu Jehovah. Vide etiam Matth. x. 40. xviii. 5. Marc. ix. 37. Luc. x. 16. I Cor. viii. 12.

<sup>m</sup> See the Preface to my Second Collection of Controversial Letters, p. lv, lvi.

<sup>n</sup> Ἱερομύστης, ἰερομυστήρια ἐκπαιδεύων καὶ διδάσκων. Suidas, Phavorinus.

<sup>o</sup> Ἱεροφάντης, μυσταγωγὸς ἱερῶν ὁ τὰ μυστήρια δεικνύων. Hesychius, Suidas.

the

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 9

the things signified by them are there, for which Reason many Christian Writers thought it fit, and proper to translate the Use of them from Heathenism to Christianity, and from the Priesthoods, and religious Rites and Mysteries of the Gentiles to the Christian Church. St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Ephesians, tells them they were the Disciples of St. Paul, Πάῶλε Συμμύσαι τῷ ἡλιασμένῳ, for <sup>p</sup> Μύσης, signifies a Scholar as well as a Master, and a Learner as well as a Teacher of Holy Mysteries; and Tertullian in his <sup>a</sup> Apology, doth by Allusion call the Christian Bishop *Pater Sacrorum*, who had among the Latins the same Office as the *Mystes*, *Mystagogus*, or *Hierophantes* had among the Greeks. It is well known how the <sup>r</sup> Author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, under the Name of *Dionysius Areopagita*, affects the Words. And <sup>t</sup> Gregory Nazianzen saith, that Christ as a *Mystes* taught his Disciples the Mysteries of the Passover. It would be tedious to shew how the Fathers call'd the Two Sacraments by the Name of *Μυσταγωγία*, nor need we wonder, when

<sup>p</sup> Μύσης, ὁ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπιστάμενος ἢ διδάσκων. Suidas. Μύσης, τελέμενος, Σιωπηλός, τὰ μυστήρια μαθὼν, μεμνημένος. Hesych.

<sup>a</sup> At quin volentibus initiari moris est, Opinor, prius patrem illum Sacrorum adire, quæ præparanda sunt describere, tum ille Infans tibi Necessarius, &c.

<sup>r</sup> He calls the Apostles ἱερωμένους cap. 11. De divinis nominibus. And de Ecclesiast. Hierarchia Sect. 4. p. 201. he calls the Apostles, and Writers of the New Testament ἱερογέγρας, and Christ πρῶτον ἱερογέγρατον, according to Tertullian, who calls him *Authenticum Pontificem Dei patris*, *Eliminatorem humanarum Macularum*, & *Sacriticiorum æternum Antifistitem*. He also calls the Catechetical Institution into the Christian Religion Μύσης de Hierarch. Eccles. p. 22. And the Bishops (whom the Historian calls the *Priests of Christ*) who instructed Constantine the Great in the Christian Religion, made no Difficulty in what they said to him, to call Baptism Μύσης, the Baptized μεμνημένοι, and the Unbaptized Ἀμύητοι. Sozom. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. Cap. 3.

<sup>t</sup> Orat. XL. p. 659. Χεῖρας μυσταγωγῆς τὸν μαθητὰς τὸ πάχος.

## 10 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Word *Μυστήριον*, *Mystery* is so often used in the New Testament. The Kingdom of Heaven, or the Kingdom of God, as the Church is called by our Lord, had its *Institutions* and *Mysteries*, and 1 Cor. 4. 1. the Ministers of it are call'd the Stewards or Dispensers of the *Mysteries* of God; which Expression, whether Mr. Toland will or no, is a plain Description or Gloss of a *Mythagogue*, even as plain and significant a Description of an Hierophant or *Mythagogue* as that of *Hesychius*, "*A Mythagogue is a Priest who instructs, a Learner of religious Mysteries* ; or that in "*Suidas*, *A Mythagogue is a Priest, who is a Teacher of Mysteries*. Hence St. Paul, as an Hierophant or *Mythagogue* of the Gospel, desires the *Colossians* to pray for him, that God would open unto him a Door of Utterance to speak the *Mystery* of Christ. If you desire to see more, applicable to this purpose, you may consult 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5, 6, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 16. Rom. xvi. 25, Eph. iii. 3, 4. Coloss. 1. 25, 26, 27. — ii. 2. Which Places being consider'd, I believe it will be impossible for Mr. Toland that bold Enemy to all Revealed Religion, to give a good reason why a Christian Priest, or *Pater Sacratius*, may not as properly be called a *Myster* in one Sense for a *Mythagogue*, (whose Office it is to initiate into the Mysteries of the *Christian Sect*) as well as the Learners whom he initiates and instructs, are so called in the other. St. Ignatius, as I have shew'd, so calls the latter; and why we may not so esteem and call the former, I can give no reason, tho' the Word is not to be found in the Writings of the New Testament, since the thing in other Words is denoted there. In like manner the *Mi-*

---

\* *Matth. xii. 28. Mark xi. 10. Luke vii. 28. ix. 2.*

\* *Μυστήριος, ἱερὺς ὁ τοῦ μυστηρίου.*

\* *Μυστήριος, ἱερὺς μυστηρίων διδάσκαλος. Μυστήριον. τὰ μυστήρια διδάσκει.*



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 11

*Ministers* of the Christian Church have been ever deem'd, and spoken of as *Priests* from the time of the Apostles by the Church and Church-Writers, who could not be ignorant of the common Notion of Priesthood among Jews and Gentiles, and of the Nature of their own Ministry; and who had more Sanctity than to usurp the Title of Priests, when they first began to be so call'd, if they had not known and believed themselves to be such, and their Office, in which they minister'd unto God, to be as truly, and properly Sacerdotal under the New Law, as that of *Aaron* and his Sons was under the Old. It was indeed a *Priesthood* of a different Kind and Religion, nay of a more simple Kind, because of a more simple Religion; of a more simple, free, and easie Kind, because in Conformity to Christianity, which was but reform'd Judaism, it was stripp'd of much ceremonial Pomp, and many carnal Rites; and servile and burthensome Observances impos'd upon them till *the time of Reformation*; and particularly discharged of all the *Sacrifices by Slaughter and Blood*, as of Goats, Bulls and Calves, to which Christ put an end by his one offering up of himself once upon the Cross for the Sins of the whole World. But then, tho' it was a more simple Priesthood than the Levitical, yet nevertheless they thought it had the Nature and Notion of Priesthood, as much as that Ministry, or else it is difficult to imagine, that the Successors to the Apostles after the Destruction of *Jerusalem* should arrogate, and assume to themselves a Title which did not truly belong to them, as Ministers of the New Testament. They undoubtedly knew the reasons, for which the Apostles, and Presbyters in the Infancy of the Church did not call themselves Priests; but if they had thought their Office, and Ministry was not a Priesthood, they would also have abstain'd from the Title of Priests after their Example; but since

## 12 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

since they did not, it is reasonable to presume, that they thought their Office to be *truly Sacerdotal*, and that the great Difference which *Grotius* saith was between them, consisted in Circumstance as to their different Succession, and Designation, and not in Essence or Substance; as will appear from the Scriptures of the New Testament, as expounded by the consentient Opinion and Practice of all Christians till of late Years. And \* as *Tully* saith, *That the Consent of all Men is the Voice of Nature*: So the Consent of all Christians in Opinion, and Practice for so many Ages, ought to be receiv'd as the undoubted Sense of the Scriptures, and the Voice of the Catholick Church; and particularly as to this thing, as well as others, which I have prov'd by several Instances, are in the Scriptures of the New Testament, and may be prov'd from thence, tho' they are not named therein.

---

### CH A P. II.

I. **W**herefore I proceed to shew in the second Place, that tho' the Names of *Priest* and *Priesthood*, as apply'd to Bishops and Presbyters, and their Office, are not to be found in the New Testament; yet the things signified by them are there, and properly belong to the Ministers, and Ministry ordained by Christ under the Dispensation of the Gospel, which is the very End, Substance, and *Veneris* of the Mosaick Oeconomy, and the fulfilling of the Mosaick Law.

To evince this, I begin with the Description, or Definition of an High-priest, or Priest, which the Apostle gives us in the fifth Chapter of his Epistle

---

\* *Dr. Beveridge's Prooemium* above cited.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 13

to the *Hebrews*, verse 1st. Every High-Priest, (saith he) taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins. Or, Every High-Priest is taken from among Men, and ordained in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins: That is, every High-Priest is taken from among Men, and ordained for Men, to <sup>1</sup> preside in holy Matters <sup>2</sup> relating to God, or the Worship of God; or as the *Syriac* Version renders the Place, every High-Priest among Men stands for Men in things that are of God, i. e. every High-Priest on Earth among Men stands in the Presence of God to perform divine Offices for them, and for <sup>3</sup> their Benefit and Good, to reconcile them to God, and God to them, or to obtain Graces and Favours to them from him, and as it were to interpose between him and them. So in the 11<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the same Epistle, verse 17. the Apostle describing the Priesthood of Christ from the Nature of the Priesthood, or Priestly Office among the Jews, saith, in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his Brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People.

II. Sir, you know the Words in the Original here and in the 1st Verse of the 5<sup>th</sup> Chapter are τὰ ἄνθρωπων ἰου, and perhaps you may also know, that the Apostle took them from the Greek Translation of the

<sup>1</sup> Pro hominibus præest rebus divinis. Castal.

<sup>2</sup> Etabli pour les hommes, en ce qui regarde le culte de Dieu. Mons-Testament. Etabli pour les hommes, en ce qui regarde Dieu. Le Clerc.

<sup>3</sup> A cause des hommes, pour leur bien; & leur utilité; à fin de les reconcilier à Dieu, ou de leur obtenir quelques graces, & bien faits de lui, & ainsi s'interposer entre Dieu, & eux. In the great French Bible on the Place, published with large Notes by Samuel and Henry des Marets, Amsterdam, MDCLXIX.

#### 14 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

Old Testament, Exod. xviii. 19. where *Jethro* saith unto *Moses*, הוּה אַתָּה לַעֲמֹל מִלִּי הָאֱלֹהִים *Thou art the People to Godward*, that thou mayest bring the *Caus* unto God. In other Versions, *Be thou to the People before God*, or *in the Presence of God*, or *be thou to the People (à parte Dei) on God's part*, or as the vulgar Latin Translation, *Be thou to the People in things pertaining to God*. Or, *be thou for the People in things towards God*, or as *Castalio*, *Tu populi rem apud Deum agito*, *Do thou the Peoples Business with God*. So in Exod. iv. 16. where God told *Moses* that *Aaron* should be his <sup>a</sup> Prophet, and he should be *Aaron's* Prince, the Greek and Latin Translations have it, *He shall speak for thee to the People*, *he shall be a Mouth unto thee*, and thou shalt be unto him <sup>c</sup> in things pertaining to God; that is, Thou shalt be unto him a <sup>e</sup> King. From hence, Sir, I think it is plain, that the Priest's Office is the same in Sacred, as *Moses's* was in Civil Affairs. When as King, or Ruler of the Twelve Tribes in the beginning of the Theocracy, he ministred in temporal Matters betwixt God and the People. Hence *Grotius* thinks that the 6<sup>th</sup> Verse of the xcix<sup>th</sup> Psalm, ought not to be rendred *Moses and Aaron among his Priests*, but rather, *Moses and Aaron among his Ministers*; that is, *Moses* among his Ministers of State, and *Aaron* among his Priests, or Ministers of his Church. For the original Word *Cohen* signifies

<sup>b</sup> *Esto tu populo in his, quæ ad Deum pertinent.*

<sup>c</sup> *Que tu sois pour le peuple envers Dieu.* Great French Bible.

<sup>d</sup> Exod. viii. 1. <sup>e</sup> Lelohim.

<sup>f</sup> Grot. Hebraice, Tu eris ipse in Deum, i. e. *Tus gladii habebis in ipsum & alios.* Nunquam enim hoc nomen hominibus datur, nisi ad significandum jus vitæ, & necis. *Fagius*, Et tu eris illius Deus. Nam principes, iudices, & magistratus Dii vocantur in Scriptura, propterea quod Dei iudicium exercent, ut Hebræi loquuntur. See also Chap. vii. 1.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 15

in its general Signification *Λειτουργός*, *Minister*; and though it is most commonly used in the Old Testament to denote a sacred Minister or Priest, yet sometimes it is used to denote a Prince or great Man in the State, as in 2 Sam. viii. 18, Where it is said, that Benaiah *was over the Cherethites and Pelethites*, there it is said of the Sons of David, that they were *Cohenim*, which we render *Chief Rulers*, and the Greek Translation, <sup>a</sup> *Princes, or Rulers of the Court*. So in Gen. xli. 43. what our, and other Translations render <sup>b</sup> *Priest of On*, the Chaldee Version translates *Rabba deon, Prince of On*, and some of the Criticks, think it the better Version. So saith <sup>c</sup> Buxtorf, *Cohen* the Hebrew Word, sometimes is used in a large Sense for *Præfects, Governours of Cities, and Provinces, and Civil Governours*, and then it is render'd in the Targum, by *Rabba*, which signifies a Prince. Wherefore as *Moses*, in his regal Capacity, was God's Minister over the People in the State; so *Aaron*, in his sacerdotal, was his Minister over them in the Church: As the one, as a temporal Prince, was his Vicegerent to transact temporal Matters between him and the People; so the other, as a Priest, or spiritual Prince was his Vicegerent to transact spiritual Matters between God, and them. They both acted as God's Ministers, tho' in different Spheres, and therefore saith *Grotius* of the Priest, *Heb. v. 1. Erat ejus officium Dei vice apud populum fungi, & populi vice apud Deum, It was the Priest's Office to be in God's Stead to the People, and the Peoples Stead to God*. I say from this comparison it is plain, that the common Notion of a Priest is to be a *Negotiator* between God and Man in sacred things, as *Moses's* was in Civil. *Aaron* was so, after God divided the Sacerdotal from the Regal Office. He was chosen

<sup>a</sup> *Ἀρχιερέας.*

<sup>b</sup> *Lexicon Rabbinicum. In Cohen.*

<sup>c</sup> *Cohen On.*

## 16 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and appointed chief Minister in the Jewish Church, as *Moses* was in the Jewish State, to transact, and mediate in all sacred Offices betwixt him, and the People: I say he was *chosen*; because, as the Apostle observes, no Man can take this Honour to himself, of standing, mediating, or interceding betwixt God and Men in divine Matters, but he that is call'd of God, as *Aaron* and his Sons were. So Christ our great Archetypal High-Priest did not arrogate to himself the Honour of the Priestly Office, because he was call'd to it by God, who said unto him, *Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee, thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedech*. This Vicegerency, or mediatory Office to transact, and minister in sacred Matters betwixt God and Man, which belongs to the Priestly Character, as such, is emphatically set forth by the Hebrew Preposition *ל* which signifies, *erga*, *adversus*, towards, *à regione*, \* over-against, *ante*, *coram*, before, in the presence of, and with *el* before it, *ἀντίστοιχόν*, *in terminis*, or *in medio duorum*, in the Boundaries, or middle between two, nigh, near; and *ad* to. And therefore by the Import of *ל* *לפני* *ל*, of which the Apostle's Greek is but the Translation, the Priest is the common Manager, or Minister of sacred Affairs betwixt God and the People, over whom, by God's Appointment, he is Priest. He is their *Procurator*, or Proxy, to transact with him, and his Procurator to transact with them. He stands and acts as Mediator between both Parties, as it were in the middle Line of Conversation, and in the very Center of Communication betwixt them. He limits and regulates the Intercourse on both sides between them, as their common Vicegerent; and in this double re-

---

\* Hence in the German Version by *M. Luther*, *Hebr. v. 1.* is render'd thus: *For every High-Priest that is taken from among Men, is set, or placed for Men over against God. Der werd Geleyt fur die Menschen gegen Gott.*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 17

lation to the two Parties is conceiv'd to be as it were posted *between*, or in the *middle* of them, and over-against them both. When he speaks to, or acts with the People in God's Name, God is understood to draw nigh unto them; and when he speaks to him, or for them in their Name, and as their *Orator*, they are understood to draw nigh unto him. A Priest then, properly speaking, is *Moul le gnam haeloim*, and *Moul lehoim ha gnam*, a Person ordained to act for the People God-ward, and for God to the People-ward; i. e. as learned Men are wont to express it, *Pro hominibus constituitur in iis quæ erga Deum, & pro Deo constituitur in iis, quæ erga homines aguntur. Adstat propter populum coram Deo, & propter Deum coram populo.* To express my self about the proper Notion of a Priest in other Words: He is an *Advocate*, *Mediator*, *Intercessor*, *Negotiator*, *Representative*, *Vicegerent*, *Mandatary*, *Interpellant*; or if there is any other Name that will better express the Force of the Hebrew and Greek Words, or better suit with the *honourable Character* or Office of a Priest, who by Divine Institution is to officiate between God and Man, in their Spiritual Addresses to, and Negotiations one with the other.

The Heathens themselves had the same common Notion of Priests, and Priesthood. They accounted them as *Mediators* betwixt God and Men, being obliged to offer the *Sacrifices* of the People to their Gods; and on the other side, *Equivali* ~~to~~ *Dei* ~~and~~ *Aggnois*, deputed by the Gods to be their *Interpreters* to Men, to instruct them how to pray for themselves, what it was most expedient to ask, what *Sacrifices*, what *Gifts* would be most acceptable to the Gods; and, in short, to teach them all the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* in *Divine Worship*. These are the Words of a most learned Antiquary, in the beginning of the Third Chapter of the Second

## 18 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Book of his *Archæologia Græca*; or the *Antiquities of Greece*. Here I am invited to observe how the common Notion of Priesthood, and the Idea of a Priest answering to it, were expressed by the Pagan *Goths*, or rather *Germans*, in Words which are formed from their Word, *GUD*, which signifieth *God*, and in the plural is *GUDIN*, *Gods*. Those Words are *GUDINASSUS*, and *GUDI*, or *GUDA*; from whence also the Verb *Gudinon* signifies to do the Office of a Priest. These Words were all transferred from the idolatrous use of them to the Christian Religion, as may be seen in the *Gothick Gospels*; and according to their Notation they signify the Ministers, and Ministry of any God, whatever he be, true or false. No doubt but their religious Worship and Rites were as various as their Gods; but whoever was appointed, as a publick Minister, in the Service of any of their Gods, he was *GUDI*, his Office *GUDINASSUS*, and he was said *GUDINON*, when he performed Divine Service of what Nature soever it was; purely *Moral*, without Signs or Symbols, or *Mystical*, or *Sacramental*, with Signs or Symbols: both which sorts of divine Offices all Religions ever had.

III. Now, Sir, to apply this general Notion of a Priest, or Priesthood, I would fain ask your late *Writer*, if it doth not properly belong to Christian Bishops, and Priests. Are they not <sup>as</sup> taken, or separated from Men, as *Aaron* and his Sons were, *Leviten*, *israhel*, *GUDINON*, *Ministrare*, *fungi Sacerdotio*; or in the Words of our Translation, to *Minister unto the Lord* in the Priestly Office? Are they not *Le gnam moul haelohim*, *populo in his*, *quæ ad Deum pertinent*? Ordained for Men in things pertaining to God? Do they not stand in the Presence of God to perform Mystical as well as Moral Offices,



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 19

and minister in his holy Worship for the Benefit of the People, and serve before him, especially at the Altar, to make Reconciliation for their Sins? <sup>n</sup> Are they not *à parte Dei*, on God's part to the People? Do they not negotiate their Business with him? Are they not his Vicegerents to them; and their Vicegerents to him; and act between God and them in sacred, as *Moses* did in civil Things? Are they not *Mediators*, *Intercessors*, or *Procurators* betwixt God and Man, and, as such, transact and minister in sacred Matters between them? Are they not Representatives of both Parties, and placed by the Nature of their Office, as it were *el mohl, in terminis*, on the Frontier of Intercourse, or in the middle Line of Communication between them? Do they not speak to, and act with the People in God's Name, and with God in the Name of the People? Is it not their Office to initiate them by the Mystical Washing of Baptism, and to offer their Sacrifices as well as Prayers and Praises, and Thanksgivings to him. And to bless them more especially in the more solemn Benedictions of their publick Ministrations, *Sacramental* or not *Sacramental*: of which latter sort are their Offices of *mere Prayer*, as also those in and by which they consecrate Things or Persons to God. And on the other side, are they not deputed and appointed by him to be his Interpreters, and the Interpreters of his Laws, and Will, and Pleasure in all things to them? I cannot think that your *late Writer*, upon more mature Thoughts, will deny this; and if he will not deny it then he must grant, that Bishops, and Presbyters are properly Priests, and, like *Aaron* and his Sons, properly ordain'd in things pertaining to God. I am persuaded, *Sir*, that no

---

<sup>n</sup> *Sacerdos in altari vice Christi fungitur, & Sacrificium verum, & plenum Deo Patri in Passionis Unigeniti sui offert recordationem.*  
Cyprian. Epist. 68.

## 20 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

sober Man, or sound Reasoner, will deny this Proposition, that considers the Nature of the several holy Offices, that Ministers over the Christian Church are ordained to perform under, and by the Authority of our Sovereign *High-Priest*, the Son of God. Though it would take up a great deal of Time to shew this out of the more ancient, and modern Offices of the Church; yet I would take the pains to prove it from them all, that Bishops and Presbyters are, truly and properly speaking, *Sacerdotal Ministers* of God, and their Offices of a Sacerdotal Nature, but that I think it needless to go about to prove a thing, which will be evident to any Man, who will but read and consider the several Offices of our own Church, and apply the common Notion of a Priest, and Priesthood, as I have explained it out of the Scriptures, and in which, as in the Notion of Temple, and Sacrifice, both Jews and Heathens did agree. ° In *Jul. Pollux* Priests are called οἱ ἱερεῖς θεῶν, *the Ministers of the Gods*; and in *Suidas* ἱερεῖον, the Priesthood, is according to the *Egyptians* said to be θεῶν διακονία, *the Ministry, or Service of the Gods, and to be conversant about the Immortality of Souls, and the things of the other State, and Virtue, and Vice.* All which agree to the Christian Ministry, and shew it to be a proper Priesthood, and the Ministers of it to be διακονοί, *Ministers in things that relate to God, as Pollux also calls Priests.* I hope it will not be much from the purpose, or give Offence to any thinking Man, if I here set down the Expressions which *Dionysius Halicarnassensis* uses in the Second Book of his *Roman Antiquities*, in describing the Priests, and several sorts of Priesthoods instituted by King *Numa*, to see whether the common Notion they had of Priests, and the Priestly Office, is applicable to the Ministers, and Ministry of the Chri-

---

° Lib. I. cap. I. Segm. 24.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 21

stian Church : They are these ; ἱερᾶδ', sacerdotio  
 fungi, to execute the Priest's Office, as in this : ὅ  
 πάντες ἱερωμένοι ἔβη, to exercise the Priest's Office  
 all their Lives long. Ἱερεῖα μελίσ, the Office of the  
 Chief Pontiff or Priest. τῇ δὲ Νύμφῃ  
 ἑλπίσας μερισμὸν ὑπορ ἱερῶν, ἐν ἑλαχονοίᾳ ἡ με  
 γιστῶν ἱερεῖαν, καὶ θεοῖαν ἔχοντες, the last part of  
 Numa's Institutions about sacred things, was that which  
 was allotted to them who had the chief Priesthood, and  
 Power. Μία ἡ ἱερουργῶν ἑξάταξις, the first Order of  
 the holy Ministeries. ἔτοι τέλει μύσας τινας ἱερουργίας  
 ἐπέτελλον, these performed certain appointed holy Mini  
 strations. Ὁ ἀνδρὸς ἐν ἀπειρῇ τῷ θεῷ τὰ θεῖα (ω  
 φίας, from a Man not ignorant of divine Matters, or  
 Mysteries. Παρθένων τὰς διεργατείας καλεσθέντων τῇ  
 Θεῷ, he ordained Virgins to be Ministers (or Priestesses)  
 to the Goddess. Αἱ ἡ διεργάσσου ἡ Θεῶν παρ  
 θέναι τέλειαις μὴ καὶ ἀρχαῖς, the Virgins, which at  
 first were Ministers (or Priestesses) to the Goddess,  
 were but four. ὅλα πολλὰ ἱερουργῶν ὡς ἐμνήσθων,  
 through the multitude of the holy Offices which they  
 perform. Τῆς ἐν ὁσίως καθήκοντος τοῖς ἱερεῖς, of the  
 Priestesses who did not minister aright in holy things. Ἡ  
 τῷ τὰ θεῖα νομοθεσία, an institution of things pertai  
 ning to God, or Divine Matters. Καὶ γὰρ δικάζουσιν  
 ἔτοι τὰς ἱερὰς δικὰς ἀπάσας ἰδιώτας τὴν καὶ ἀρχαῖς, καὶ  
 λοιποῖς Θεῶν — τὰς τε ἀρχαῖς ἀπάσας, ὅσας δυοῖα  
 τε καὶ διεργατείας ἀνάκειν, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἀπαντὰς ἐξελά  
 ζουσιν, the chief Pontiffs have Cognisance of all Causes  
 relating to holy Matters, both among private Men and  
 Magistrates, and the Ministers (or Priests) of the  
 Gods — And they examine all Magistrates to whose  
 Care Sacrifice, and the Worship of the Gods is committed,  
 and all Priests whatsoever. Πολλὰς ἡ βώμης καὶ ναεῖ  
 ἰδρύμεν ἱερὰς τε ἐκείνῳ αὐτῷ ἀπονέμων, καὶ ὀμνησσο  
 μένους αὐτῷ ἱερῶν καθίσας, he (Numa) built many  
 Altars, and Temples; and appointed several Festival  
 Days for every one of them, and ordained Priests, who

## 22 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

were to take care of them: Περιλαβὼν ὃ ἅπαρ περὶ τὰ θεῖα νομοθεσίαν, διέειλεν εἰς ὅκτω μοίρας, farthermore, Numa having committed his whole Institution, about matters of Religion to writing, he divided them into eight parts. Τοῖς ὃ ἰδιώταις ὁπόσοι μὴ ἴσασι τὰς περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἢ δαμόνια (εἰασμὸς ἐξηγεῖσθαι γίνον), καὶ περὶ τῶν, they are the Expositors and Interpreters of matters of Religion to the People, who are ignorant of them. <sup>P</sup> Περὶ ἐν τῇ ἱερῶν τῇ ὅτι εἴτε βέλτεροι τις αὐτὸς ἱεροδιδασκάλως κομῆειν, εἴτε ἱερόνομος, εἴτε ἱεροφύλακας, εἴτε ὡς ἡμεῖς ἀξιόμην ἱεροφάντας, ἐχ' ἀμνησῆσθαι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, wherefore as to these Priests, (understanding the chief Pontiffs) if a Man will call them Teachers of holy Things, or Administrators of holy Things, or Keepers and Curators of holy Things; or, as I think, the chief Masters in teaching holy Things, he will not err from the Truth.

Sir, I think I have omitted no Word, or Expression by which my Author describes the Priestly Office, but *θυπόλ*, which *Pollux* reckons among the poetical Names for a Priest; and according to the Notation of that Word, it signifies <sup>a</sup> one conversant, or employed about Offerings and Sacrifices, as I shall hereafter shew, the Ministers of the Church are. But in the mean time let me ask your late Writer, whether the Terms of my Author are not in Propriety applicable to the *Christian Ministry*. Is it not properly ἱερουργία and θειουργία τῇ Θεῷ, or λατρεία τῇ Θεῷ, and περὶ τὰ θεῖα νομοθεσία? And are we not, properly speaking, ἱεροφύλακες? who may properly be said, when we minister in our holy Offices Sacramental, or not Sacramental, and with or

<sup>P</sup> So in *Plutarch's Life of Numa*. Ὁ δὲ μέγιστος τῇ πολιτείᾳ, καὶ ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ περὶ τὰς, μάλλον δὲ ἱεροφάντης τὰς ἐν ἐπέχῃ, καὶ μόνον τῇ δημοσίᾳ δρωμένων ἐμπληρῶν, ἀλλὰ δὴ ἰδίᾳ θυονίας ἐπισκοπῶν, καὶ κωλύων παρεκβαίνειν τὰ γενομισμένα, καὶ διδάσκων ὅτι τις δέοιτο πρὸς Θεῶν τίμῳ ἢ ἀδελφίσῃ.

<sup>a</sup> *θυπόλ* ὁ ἱερός, ὁ περὶ τὰς θυσίας ποιῶν, καὶ ἀναστρεφόμενος. *Hesych. Phavor.* Ὁ θυὸν ἱερός θυπολῶσι, περὶ τὰ θεῖα ποιεῖσθαι. Διὰ θυσιῶν ἀπὸ γένεσθαι θεῶν ἐκτελεσθαι. *Suidas.* with-



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 23

without Holy Rites, ἱερᾶς, or ἱερῶν; Are we not ἱερεῖς, and δεσποῖνες τῶ Θεῷ, in propriety of Speech, and ἁγῆς ἡ Θεῷ, or ἁγῆται τῶ Θεῷ? Are we not ἡ ἱερὴ ἐκκλησία? And in full propriety of Speech, ἡ ἱερὴ ἐκκλησία, ἡ πρεσβυτέρη, Teachers, and Interpreters of holy Things? Is not the Episcopal Office μελίσση ἱερᾶς; And may it not be properly said of our Bishops, that ἡμεῖς ἡ ἱερὴ ἐκκλησία μελίσσωμεν, or that τὰς ἱερὰς δίκας ἀπάσας δικάζωμεν, or that they have Power, τὰς ἱερὰς ἀπαντας ἐκτελεῖν; Are not they principally, and their Presbyters under them ἱεροδιδάσκαλοι, ἱερόνομοι, ἱεροφύλακες, and ἱεροφάνη; And is not their Office περὶ τὰ ἱερὰ, or περὶ τὰ θεῖα ποιεῖν, to be conversant about holy and divine Things? Or is it not as St. \* Cyprian speaks, *Divinis rebus & spiritualibus occupari, operationibus divinis insistere, Celestibus rebus & spiritualibus servire: To be employ'd in Divine and Spiritual Matters, to apply themselves wholly to Divine Ministrations, and to devote themselves to Heavenly and Spiritual Things?* How like are my Heathen Author's Descriptions of Priests and Priesthood to those of this Holy Father; and if they are properly applicable to Christian Ministers, and their Ministry, as I think they are, then, I hope, Sir, we have a good Title to the Priesthood, and without the help of a Metaphor, may be dignified with the holy and honourable Name of Priests. If these Descriptions belong to our holy Office, the thing described by them must belong to us, according to this Maxim in Logick, *Cui convenit definitio, & eidem convenit definitum.* Your late Writer may undervalue the Name, and Character of Priest, and put it as far as he will from himself, but I value it to the highest degree; and I speak it to God's Honour, I had rather be the poor deprived Priest that I am, with all

---

\* 1 Epist. Edit. Oxon.

## 24 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Hatred, and Contempt, and Persecution that now attends the Christian Priesthood in this most irreligious Age, than be *Primier*, or *Plenipotentiary* to the greatest Monarch, or the most victorious Conqueror in the World. The Hebrew Word *Cohen*, which, in relation to God, all Translations render *Priests*, signifies primarily a Minister, *ᾠνηεῖς Θεῷ*, as *Pollux* also calls a *Priest*, and it is a verbal Noun derived from the Verb *Ciben*, which signifies *Δεισιτελεῖν*, to minister, and as *λειτεργός*, when it relates to God and sacred Matters, signifies a *Priest*, or Minister of the Church; so when it relates to the King, as I observed before, it signifies a *Prince*, or Minister of State. From which Notation of the Word it follows, that Bishops and Presbyters, as Ministers of God, and employed in his Service, are *Cohens*, or *Priests*; or as *Philo* describes the Jewish Priests, they are *οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸ ἱερόν ᾠνηεῖς*, *καὶ λειτερεῖς*, Servants and Ministers of God, to perform holy Offices in his Temple; or as the Apostle speaks, *τῶν ἁγίων λειτερεῖς*, Ministers of the Sanctuary, or holy Things, *ἱερεῖς ἱερῶν ἁγίων*, Ministers about holy things, *καὶ θυσιολογεῖν προσεδεδόκητες*, Waiters at the Altar, or the same to the one true God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, what *Plutarch* saith that the Priests of the Gentiles were to their Idols, *ἱερεῖς Θεῶν λειτερεῖς*, Priests are the Ministers or Liturges of the Gods. So *Acts* xiii. 2. Barnabas and Paul's ministering to the Lord by Fasting and Prayer, is thus expressed, *λειτερεῖν τῶν αὐτῶν κατὰ κυρίαν*. In which place, as well as in *Hebr.* viii. 2. had the holy Writers written in *Hebrew*, I doubt not but they would have expressed themselves by *Cohen*, and *Cihen*; for what is expressed the Priest's Office, *Luke* i. 8, 9. by *ὅτι καὶ ἱεροδιδάσκων*, and *ἱερολεῖα*, is expressed by *λειτουργία*, Ministry, in the 23d Verse, and therefore

---

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 25

the Ministers of God, and Christ, by all Analogy, must be sacerdotal Ministers, *λεῖτερες* τοῦ Ἰησοῦ *χρῆς*, *Cohens*, or Ministers of Jesus Christ, as St. Paul calls himself, *Rom. xv. 16*. Hence the Words *λεῖτερες*, *λεῖτερες*, *λεῖτερες*, came in Ecclesiastical Writers to be appropriated to the Service of God, and Priestly Ministration of holy things, as in *Canon IV. Concil. Antioch.* εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος, &c. If any Bishop deposed by the Synod, or Priest, or Deacon deprived by the Bishop, presume to do any Liturgical Act, *τολμήσῃ τι ποιεῖν τὸ λεῖτερίας*, he shall not be restored. Balsamon on the Place paraphraseth the Words in this Expression, *ιερωτικὸν τι ἐνεργήσας*, to do any part of the Priestly Office; and Zonaras upon the same Canon saith, that *λεῖτερες* in this Place doth not only signify τὴν ἱερουργίαν, καὶ τὴν τελετὴν τὴν ἀναιμάντις θυσίας μόνον, not only the Performance of divine Services, and the Celebration of the unbloody Sacrifice [of the Eucharist] ἀλλ' ἅπαν Ἀρχιερωτικὸν δίκαιον, but all the Functions of the Chief-Priest. The New Covenant is better than the Old, and the House of Christ much more Excellent than that of Moses, in as much as the Christian is the full Improvement, and Perfection of the Mosaick Religion and Worship, and therefore it would be strange if either the Liturgical Ministrations of the Christian Worship for Men, should be less holy, or pertain less to God for them than those of the Jewish Church; or the Christian Liturgs, or Ministers, should either not at all be Priests, or Priests in a less proper Sense than those of the Levitical Order and Institution, who were Ministers by Fire and Immolation under the First Testament. What is there in the Notation of ἱερεὺς, or *Sacerdos*, that doth not properly belong to the

---

\* Sacer, cra, um. quicquid ad religionem pertinet. Sacerdos. d.  
Sacer, qui Sacris præst, & ea administrat, quasi sacra dans. Isidor.

## 26 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Christian Ministers: They only denote *holy* Ministers, or Ministers of *holy* Things; Ministers of God for the People in holy Offices, and Employments, whatever those Offices be, Ministers of divine Rites and Services for Men, of what kind soever those Rites and Services be. For as there have been different Churches, and Religions, so there have been different Rites and Services in them, and yet the Ministers of those different holy Rites and Services for the People to their God, have all been counted Priests, as agreeing in the common Notion of Priesthood, which is the Function, or Office of a Person separated, or taken from Men, and ordained *ωγς τὸ ἱερρεῖαν*, or, *Θερεῖαν*, as human Authors speak, to minister for the People in holy Services pertaining to God.

IV. Wherefore as there are several sorts of Religions, so there are several sorts of Priesthood, as among the Heathens <sup>u</sup>, whose Sacrifices and Priests, or Ministers of holy Rites, were as different as the Deities, and Rites themselves. Some were Men, and some Women; some of their Services were more simple, and some more ceremonious; some sacrificed by Blood, and Slaughter, and Burning, and some not; some used Rites and Ceremonies of this kind in sacrificing, and some of that: The <sup>w</sup> ancient *Persians* had no Temples, nor Statues, nor Altars, and in sacrificing to their Gods they never used Fire, or Libations, or the *Mola Salsa* made of Meal and Salt, or Musick, or Pontifical Miters, and yet the Ministers

---

<sup>u</sup> *Jam sacrorum ritus, statasque, ac solemnes Ceremonias non est, quod à me quisquam expectet. Itaque nec quæ cuique Deo grata decoraque essent hostia, nec cui maribus, cui fœminis, cui majoribus, cui lætæntibus immolaretur, dicam. Nec fœrciminum, liborum, & pul-tium, vel vasorum, quibus in sacris locus erat, nomina, & genera recensibo, nec denique quò ordine, ritûque res divinæ fierent, explicabo.* B.isson. de Formul. Lib. 1. p. 36. See also Dr. Potter's Antiquities of Greece. Book II. cap. 3. p. 306.

<sup>w</sup> Herodot. Lib. 1. Cap. cxxxi.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 27

of their Gods were as proper Priests, as those of the *Romans*, and *Gracians*, who used all these things. Nay, the *Romans*, for an hundred and seventy Years after *Numa*, tho' they built Temples, yet they had no sort of Images to represent their Gods, being taught by that great King, Lawgiver, and Priest, that there could be no representation of God, who was invisible, and incorruptible; but his *Idea* in the Mind of Man. In that Period also their Sacrifices were simple *Pythagorean*, and unbloody Oblations, as *Plutarch* tells us in the \* Life of *Numa*, whither I refer you. The *Mahometans* have no bloody Sacrifices, or Altars for them but <sup>v</sup> at *Mecca*, and offer them but once in the Year; yet they look upon the Ministers of their Religion separated from the People in all other Places, as proper Priests, as those of *Mecca*. For <sup>z</sup> Expiation, Atonement, or Propitiating  
an

\* P. 65. Edit. Lutetiz. MDCXXIV.

<sup>v</sup> Herbelot's *Biblioth. Orientale*, in the Word ADHHA. *Adhha*, a religious Feast of the *Musulmans*, which they celebrate on the tenth Day of the Month, which they call DHOULHECIAT, which is the twelfth and last Month of their Year. This Month being particularly set apart for the Ceremonies which the Pilgrims observe at *Mecca*, takes its Name from thence, for it signifies the Month of Pilgrimage. They solemnly sacrifice on that Day a Sheep at *Mecca*, and no where else; and it is called by the Name of the Feast, which the *Turks* commonly call the *Grand Beiram*, to distinguish it from the little Feast of that Name, with which they conclude their Fast, and which the Christians of the *Levant* call the *Pasque*, or *Easter* of the *Turks*. This Feast is also called *Jaum al Corban*, that is, the Day of Sacrifices and Victims. For every Pilgrim on that Day may offer as many Sheep as he will, and every one of these Sacrifices hath the Name of DHAHIAT. The *Musulmans* go out of *Mecca* unto a Valley call'd *Mina* or *Muna*, to solemnize this Feast, and there sometimes they sacrifice a Camel. The Books which treat of the Ceremonies of this Sacrifice, which is the only one the *Mahometans* have, have the Title of *Manasseck*.

<sup>z</sup> *Hebr. II. 17*. That he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People, *ch. v. 1*.  
Every

## 28 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

an offended Deity, or otherwise <sup>a</sup> procuring his favour, and good Will being the end of all material Offerings, and Sacrifices in Priestly Ministrations, as you may see in the Margin; it must follow, that if the true God is pleased to supersede, or take away the Use of them, and be as effectually propitiated, when he is offended, or otherwise made favourable by holy Ministrations without them; as before with them: then I say, it must follow, that the Li-

---

Every High-Priest, taken from among Men, is ordained for Men, in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins. 3d verse, He ought, as for the People, so also for himself to offer for Sins. *Levit. i. 4.* He shall put his Hand upon the Head of the Burnt-Offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make Atonement for him. So in *Chap. iv. 20, 26.* The Priest shall make Atonement for them. And *Chap. v. 6.* He shall bring his Trespass-Offering unto the Lord,—and the Priest shall make an Atonement for him concerning his Sin. So in the 10, 13, 16, 18, verses of the same Chapter, and the 7th verse of the 6th, The Priest shall make an Atonement for him before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him. So *Numb. xvi. 46, &c.* Moses said unto Aaron, take a Censer, and put Fire therein from off the Altar, and put on Incense, and go quickly unto the Congregation, and make an Atonement for them.—And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the Congregation, and behold the Plague was begun among the People, and he put on Incense, and made Atonement for the People, and he stood between the dead and the living, and the Plague was stayed. *Brissot de Formul. p. 22.* Litare enim Macrobius explicat, Lib. iii. Cap. v. Sacrificio facto placare Numen. Unde & Litationem Propitiationis idem dixit, Lib. i. in Somn. Scipion. Cap. viii. Nonius etiam Marcellus inter Litare, & Sacrificare hoc interesse tradit, quod Sacrificare sit veniam petere, Litare vero propitiare, & votum impetrare. Virg. *Æneid. Lib. IV.*

Tu modo posce Deos veniam, sacrisque litatis  
Indulge hospitio——

*Ubi Servius Dicit Litatis debuit dicere, non enim sacro, sed Deo sacris Litamus, i. e. Placamus, &c.*

<sup>a</sup> As in Peace-offerings, whether they were Sacrifices of Thank-giving or Free-will Offerings upon Vows: All which in the Scripture phrase are also said to be a sweet Savour unto the Lord, or that he hath respect unto them, and that he accepts them. Which are all terms to signify that God is pleased with them.

*2urgs,*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 29

*turks*, or Ministers, whose Office it is to make Expiation and Atonement for their own Sins, or for the Sins of the People, or otherwise to procure the divine Favour, *without Gifts and Sacrifices*, must be as true, and proper Ministers of Atonement, and procuring the Favour and Blessings of God, as the Priests who did the same thing with Offerings and Sacrifices, and, by consequence, be true Priests; because in the same manner as Priests, they are taken from the People, and ordained for them in things pertaining to God; that by *Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and Praises, and Thanks*, which they offer up to him, according to his own Appointment, without Sacrifice, or sacrificial Rites, they may reconcile God, and make Atonement for their own, and the Peoples Sins, or otherwise procure his Favour and Blessings to themselves, and them. For Gifts and Sacrifices, *i. e.* <sup>b</sup> *Offerings of inanimate Things, and of Animals*; or Offerings without or with Slaughter, were both of an <sup>c</sup> honorary Nature, for as it was thought dishonourable to their Kings to make solemn Approaches to them without Presents; especially when they were to ask or expect Favour: so was it counted dishonourable to God, to come empty-handed to wait upon him in solemn Worship, as it is written, <sup>d</sup> *none shall appear before*

*me*

---

<sup>b</sup> *Diodati upon Hebr. v. 1. Offerte.* Questa parola, posta in differenza de Sacrificii, significa l'offerte delle cose inanimate. *Jac. Capellus, Constituitur Pontifex, ut offerat dona rerum inanimatarum, & Sacrificia rerum animatarum, &c.* *Grotius, ἵνα προσέσθῃ δῶ-  
ρα, καὶ θυσίας τῶν ἀναστήτων.* *Explicat generalitatem per species  
quasdam, &c.*

<sup>c</sup> *Briffon de Formul. Lib. I. p. 33, 34.*

<sup>d</sup> *Exod. xxiii. 15. Deut. xvi. 16. So Ecclesiasticus xxxv. 4.* Thou shalt not appear empty before the Lord, for all these things are to be done because of the Commandment. The Offering of the Righteous maketh the Altar fat, and the sweet savour thereof is before the most high. The Sacrifice of a just Man is acceptable,

and

### 30 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*me empty*; and therefore the true God, as well as the false Deities, was supposed to be pleas'd, pleas'd or gratified with the Honour of Gifts, when those who brought them were duly purified, especially with virtuous and holy Minds, which the Pagan, as well as Jews, and Christians counted and called the *chief*, or *only* Sacrifices, without which no Gifts, or external, material Sacrifices, could be acceptable to any God, true, or false, and that those alone would be accepted, when these could not be had. Wherefore if we may suppose any Deity to discharge his Worshippers for any time, or altogether of those Offerings, and to order his Priests to offer up Prayers, and Supplications, and Thanksgivings, and Praises without them; his Priests would nevertheless remain proper Priests still, and their Ministrations, tho' strip'd of all sacrificial Solemnities, would yet be sacerdotal; that is to say, of as

---

and the Memorial thereof will never be forgotten. *Give the Lord his Honour* with a good Eye, and diminish not the first Fruits of thine Hands. In all thy Gifts shew a cheerful Countenance, and dedicate thy Tythes with Gladness.

\* So Commentators interpret these Verses of *Menander*, 'Eis' 22, &c. preserved in *Athenaus*, Lib. iv. p. 146. See *Persius Satyr.* ii. V. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75. *Isaiah* lvii. 15. *Pf.* li. 17. xxxiv. 18. cxxxviii. 6. *Isaiah* l. 11. lxvi. 2. *Jeremiah* vii. 9, 21, 22, 23. *Sacrificia omnia non dignitate rei oblata, sed offerentis animo estimantur.* *Grotius consult. Cass. Art.* xxiv. So in the *Morals of Confucius* we are told that though the *Chineses* offered Sacrifice, and worshipped God with extraordinary Pomp, and Magnificence, yet they taught that all this external Worship was not acceptable to the Divinity, if the Soul was not inwardly adorned with Piety, or Vertue. Which shews how weakly they argue against the Eucharistical Sacrifice, who say that under the Gospel Dispensation, instead of an external material Sacrifice the spiritual Sacrifices of the Mind are only to be offered to God, against the most express Testimonies of the Fathers for that Sacrifice, because they prefer the living Sacrifice of our selves, and of a contrite heart to it, as Jewish, and Heathen Writers do, calling it the *chief*, or *only* Sacrifice, which God requires. See the Note in p. xxix, xxx. of the *Prefatory Answer*.



### *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 31

holy a Nature, and as much pertaining to that God, and his Honour, and as acceptable to him, and of as much Force to atone him, as when they were solemniz'd with Gifts and Sacrifices, and he was honoured, and adored with them as holy Rites. Thus in the LXX Years of Captivity, when the Jews had neither Temple nor Altar, nor Sacrifice of any Sort, yet their Priests remained proper Priests, and their Ministrations, by solemn Prayers, and Supplications, and Confessions were of the same sacerdotal, holy, and honorary atoning Nature, as when they ministred at the Altar, and filled the Courts of the Temple with the Nidors of their Offerings, as it is in the *Apocryphal Prayer of Azarias*. *O Lord, we are become less than any Nation, and are kept under this day in all the World, because of our Sins. Neither is there at this time Prince, or Prophet, or Leader, or Burnt-Offerings, or Sacrifice, or Oblation, or Incense, or Place to Sacrifice before thee and to find Mercy. Nevertheless in a contrite Heart, and humble Spirit, let us be accepted, like as in the Burnt-offering of Rams and Bullocks: And like as in Ten thousand of fat Lambs, so let our Sacrifice of Penitential Prayer and Confession, and Deprecation be in thy sight this day.* Thus if their Captivity and Line of Priestly Succession had continued to this day, they would have been proper Priests still, and their Worship sacerdotal Worship, tho' without Sacrifice or Altar, and acceptable to God without their Sacrifices, and sacrificial Rites. In like manner, upon supposition that the Christian Religion hath neither Altar, nor Sacrifice, as some few Writers rashly maintain, yet the Ministers of it, as I have already shew'd from the general Notion of Priesthood, are proper Priests, or sacerdotal Ministers, and their solemn Ministrations of as holy, *hieratical*, acceptable, and atoning a Nature, as those of the Jews were, and as much pertaining to God, and as powerful

### 32 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

erful to procure his Favour and Protection, and Blessings of all sorts. Christ himself, our eternal High-Priest in Heaven, hath made Intercession for his Church, and the faithful Members of it, ever since he entered into the holy Place without any Sacrifice, only by presenting that before the Father which he offered up once for all upon the Cross. This shews that the Priest's Office doth not consist only in offering Sacrifices, but that it may be executed when and where there are no more Oblations appointed to be offered; and so at all times, and in all places where Sacrifice is no part of the Worship, or Service of God. Wherefore it was not Sacrifices, or Power to offer them, which alone made the Jewish Ministers Priests, but other holy Performances pertaining to God for which they were ordained, and the ministring in which, as well as sacrificing, belong'd to their Priestly Office; and therefore tho' it be certain there can be no Sacrifice, or sacrificing *without* Priests ordinary, or extraordinary, yet it is as certain there may be *Priests* without Offerings or Sacrifices, as when God is pleased to suspend, or abolish the Use of them; and therefore upon Supposition, that God hath abolished all sorts of Offerings and Sacrifices, as well as those by Fire or Immolation, in the Christian Religion; yet the Christian Priesthood, like the Jewish, being a separate Order of Men, severed, and set apart from the Community of the People, and, like them, ordained to act and administer for them in holy things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for Sins, and to impetrate his Favour and Blessings for them, they must be as proper Priests as the Jewish *Cohens* were in Captivity, tho' not sacrificing Priests. *Sir*, I have said thus much for the sake of such Men, as *your late Writer*, who thinks *sacrificing essential* to the Office of a Priest, and therefore denies Bishops, and Presbyters, to be proper Priests; because, as he affirms, they have no material

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 33

material Sacrifices to offer; whereas offering material Sacrifices belongs only to Priests of a *sacrificing Religion*, and is only a part of their holy ministerial Office; as many things besides offering Gifts, and Sacrifices for Sins, belonged to the Office of a Jewish Priest. It belonged to them to judge of legal Uncleanesses, and to bless the People. And as the H. Priests were to enter once a year into the Holy of Holies; so God, had he pleased, might have continued that Ordinance as a part of the holy Ministry of every Christian Bishop, to signify that Christ had entered with his own Blood into Heaven, there to appear for us in the Presence of God. But as the common Definition of a Priest doth belong to a Christian Bishop, though the Christian Religion had not that Ministrations: So granting that it hath no material Sacrifice, yet its Presbyters are *Priests*, because they are taken from among Men, and ordained for them in other things, of as solemn and holy a Nature, as Sacrifice, which pertain unto God. In truth, *Sir*, I think they may as well say, that Christian Churches are not *proper Temples*, or that the Definition of a Temple doth not properly belong to them, because they are not built after the Pattern of the Jewish Temple, nor have an Altar for Burnt-offerings in their Courts or Yards, nor an Altar for Incense, or Tables for Presence-bread in them, or a Veil to distinguish the holy from the most holy Place. Nay, *Sir*, in my Opinion, by the same way of Reasoning, your *late Writer* may deny the Christian Religion to be a proper Religion, as well as its Presbyters to be proper Priests, because, as they assert, it hath no proper Sacrifice. Do they not know, that the Shew-bread belonged only to the Priests, or Ministers of the Jewish Temple; and that they only had a right to eat it? And will they therefore deny Christian Ministers to be proper Priests, because the Christian Religion hath no such holy Bread to be always set  
for

### 34 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

for them in the Presence of God ? The Ministers of God, as Priests, received Tithes before, and under the Mosaick Law ; and St. *Paul* describes a Jewish Priest by <sup>f</sup> *taking of Tithes*, as well as by offering of Gifts and Sacrifices ; and if these Men think, as probably they do, that Tithes are not due under the Christian Religion, by divine Right to its Ministers, will they for that reason deny them to be proper Priests ? Nay, in Religions which had Sacrifices, the Ministers of it were thought to act as Priests in other Applications to their Gods, as well as in sacrificing. Thus the *sovereign* <sup>g</sup> *Pontiff* among the *Romans* acted as much the Priest in walking at the Head of that most solemn funeral sort of Procession of a *defiled Vestal*, and the secret Prayers he made, with Hands lifted up to Heaven, at the Brink of the Pit, where she was to be buried alive, as when he offered Sacrifice. And Jesus Christ, when as Advocate with his Father, and by consequence as a <sup>h</sup> Priest, though not yet so declared, he made publick and most solemn Intercession unto his Father ; the Intercession, I mean, which he made not only for <sup>i</sup> his Church at that time, but for his future Church throughout the World, with his Eyes lift up to Heaven ; I say, when he then interceded with God in a most pathetick Prayer for his little Church in *Judæa*, and his Catholick Church, which was to be dispersed over the World, he offered no Sacrifice, though he had all Power given him, and was Lord of the Temple, as well as of the Sabbath ; and might, had he pleased, have solemnized his Prayer with Burnt-Offering, and Peace-Offering, either at the great Altar of *Jerusalem*, or at any other, which he had Power to erect. This

<sup>f</sup> Hebr. vii. 8.

<sup>g</sup> Plutarch. in vita Numæ, p. 67.

<sup>h</sup> Qui Rex semper erat, Sacerdos autem factus est, quando carnem suscepit. Ambros. in Epist. ad Hebræos.

<sup>i</sup> 1 John xvii.



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 35

shews, *Sir*, tho' there can be no sacrificing without a Priest, yet that a Man may be a Priest, and act as a Priest, particularly by solemn sacerdotal Prayers and Intercession, without Sacrifice or Altar.

V. And therefore, *Sir*, it is so far from being true, that Christian Bishops, and Presbyters are not Priests for want of Oblation or Sacrifice, that it seems more consonant and reasonable to think the *Deacons who cannot offer*, to be sharers of the Priesthood in the third or lowest Rank or Order, because by their Office they have Power, and Authority, with the leave of the Bishop, to minister publick Prayers, and Praises, and to administer the Mystical, or Sacramental Office of Baptism; in the former of which divine Services the officiating Deacon acts as the Peoples Orator, or Spokesman, to offer up their Devotions to God; and in the latter he is appointed to act as God's Procurator, or Representative, to stand in his stead to receive such Candidates of Heaven as offer themselves to be baptized into Covenant with him, and inrolled into the Number of Christ's Church. In the former he solemnly and in a sacerdotal manner offers up Prayers, and Supplications, and Praises, and Thanksgivings for the People, and makes Intercessions to God for them; or what is equivalent, the People by him, or his Mouth and Ministry, offer up their Prayers and other Devotions to God; and in the latter he is the Minister of God for Remission of Sins by spiritual Regeneration, and his Vicegerent to receive the baptized Person's Profession of Faith, and his most solemn Vows and Promises; and in God's Name to release him of his Sins, and to promise him the Kingdom of Heaven, and everlasting Life, and to write his Name in the Book of Life. In these divine and honourable Ministrations the Office and Characters of Priesthood, as above described, are visible, and by consequence it is not absurd to assert,



that

### 36 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

that the Deacons, who are thus allowed to officiate, and act in things of such Weight, and Concern between God, and the People; may be deem'd Priests, or Sharers in the Priest's Office in the largest sense of Priesthood; and that their Ministration in things pertaining to God is truly and properly sacerdotal, though in the lowest degree. Of this Opinion was *Opiatus*, Bishop of *Milevi* in *Africa*, the great *Mall* of the *Donatists*, and equal to *St. Augustin* in Piety and Learning, with whom he was contemporary.

<sup>k</sup> *What need I (saith he) mention many of the Ministers, either Deacons in the third, or Presbyters constituted in the second degree of Priesthood? When in those times of Persecution, some Bishops, tho' the supreme, and chief Rulers of Clergy and People, that they might save this short uncertain Life by the loss of Life eternal, deliver'd up their Bibles to be burnt.* <sup>l</sup> So in another place, *The Church*, saith he, hath several sorts of Members: Of the Ministry, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the Flock of the faithful People. Tell me then, what sort of Men in our Church you charge with those things which you object. Perhaps there were others before this Father, who thought the Deacon's Office of a sacerdotal Nature in the lowest degree. For we read in <sup>m</sup> *Ensebius* of an Epistle of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, sent by *Hippolytus* to the Brethren at *Rome*, stiled *ἱερωτικὴ, diaconica*, which *Valesius* thinks was so called, because it treated of the Office of a Deacon, about which there might be different Sentiments, or <sup>n</sup> Disputes at that time. If any then thought it a Degree of the Priesthood, they might be led into those Sentiments by some Passages in *St. Ignatius's* Epistles, who in that to the *Trallesians* speaks of Deacons thus: *It becomes the Deacons as Ministers of the Mysteries of Jesus Christ, by all means*

<sup>k</sup> Lib. I. p. 15. Edit. Paris. Fol. 1679. <sup>l</sup> Lib. II. p. 46.

<sup>m</sup> Eccl. Hist. Lib. 6. cap. xlvii. <sup>n</sup> Concilii Niceni, Can. xviii.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 37

to study to please all. For they are not the Ministers of Meats and Drinks, but of the Church of God. Wherefore it behoves them to avoid all Offences, as they would avoid Fire. Accordingly, let all reverence the Deacons, &c. So in his Epistle to the Magnesians: I exhort you, that you study to do all things in Divine Concord, your Bishops presiding in the place of God, your Presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles, and your Deacons most dear to me, as those to whom is committed the Ministry of Jesus Christ. And then a little after he speaks of their Order, as essential to the Church; with those of the Bishops and Presbyters: ° In like manner, saith he, let all reverence the Deacons, as Jesus Christ, and the Bishop, as the Father, and the Presbyters, as the Sanhedrim of God, and College of the Apostles: Without these there is no Church. ¶ For the clearer understanding of this matter, Sir, we must remember, that in all Religions true or false there have been two sorts of Ministries, or Ministers: One of the Priests, who were Ministers of the Gods, and the other of those who were Ministers, or Servants to the Priests, who, among the Latins, were called *Ministri*, as <sup>a</sup> Brissonius hath shew'd by many Examples. Such were the Pope, or *Succincti*, who bound and slew the Victims; *Victimarii*, who prepared the Beasts for Sacrifice by holy Rites; the *Aeditui*, or *Sacristains*, who kept the holy Vessels, and Habits, and the Temple, &c. And for this reason the Ministers of the Heathen Priest call'd *Flamen Dialis*, were from him named *Flamini*. To the Pope, *Victimarii*, and *Aeditui*, among the Latins, answered, the *Κηρυκες*, or

° See Vossius in locum.

¶ St. Polycarp in his Epistle to the *Philippians* magnifies the Deacons Office almost in the same Words, saying they are not the Servants of Men but of God in Jesus Christ.

<sup>a</sup> De Formul. Lib. i. p. 15. See Rosini Antiquit. Rom. Lib. iii. Cap. xxix.

### 38 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

ιεροκήρυκες, the Νεωκόργοι, or Ζάκοργοι, and Ναοφύλακες among the Greeks : and so among the Jews the Levites were set aside to serve and attend the Priests, and do all the servile Offices of the Sacrifices, about the Tabernacle, and afterwards about the Temple, in such manner, as I need not describe. Hence came a twofold use of the Verb λειτουργεῖν, which signifies to minister, and of all the Words that come from it, in the Christian Church. For in the more <sup>r</sup> noble and usual Signification they denote Sacerdotal Ministration, but sometimes by a *Catachresis* they also denote the servile Ministry of those inferior Officers, who attended the Bishop, and Priests, and the Ministration of holy Services, and kept the Church. Λειτουργική κυρίως μὴ ἢ ιερολογική, κατὰ χρευστικῶς ὢ ἢ δογματική, Liturgical (saith the Gloss in *Suidas*) properly signifies sacerdotal, but catechrestically servile. According to which Explication of the Word, the Office of Deacon is of a double Nature, first <sup>r</sup> servile, with respect to the Bishop, and Presbyters to whom they were <sup>r</sup> subservient in the performances of holy Offices, and in other Affairs of the Church. As such they were the Bishops <sup>u</sup> Attendants and <sup>w</sup> Sub-

<sup>r</sup> Λειτουργικός, ιερολογικός, Hesychius.

<sup>r</sup> Concil. Nicen. Can. xviii. Let the Deacons contain themselves within their own Bounds, and know that they are [τῷ μὲν ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποκείμενοι] the Bishop's Servants, and inferior to the Presbyters. Const. Apost. Lib. viii. cap. xxviii. Διάκονος δὲ προσφέρει, &c. the Deacon doth not administer the Eucharist, but when the Bishop, or Presbyter administers he delivers it to the People, not as a Priest, but as one, who serves the Priests. So in the spurious but ancient Epistle of St. Ignatius to *Heron* the Deacon : Do thou nothing without the Bishops, for they are Priests, but thou art the Servant of Priests. They baptize, sacrifice, ordain, absolve ; but thou dost minister to them as St. Stephen did to *James*, and the Presbyters at *Jerusalem*.

<sup>r</sup> Habert. Pontificale Ecclesie Græcæ Observ. iii. p. 197.

<sup>u</sup> Τῷ μὲν ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποκείμενοι εἰσὶ τῷ καὶ προσκυύεων ἀνάγινος. Conc. Nic. Can. xviii.

<sup>w</sup> Habert. Obser. iv. p. 200.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 39

almoners to look after the necessitous, as Widows, and Orphans, and sick Persons, that they should be duly supplied out of the publick Stock of the Church, and his Messengers to carry his pastoral Letters, and Orders to his Flock, and his communicatory Letters to other Bishops, and Churches, and in divine Service to be the \* *ιεργήματα* or Cryers to forbid those who bore any grudge to come to the Holy Eucharist, to command Silence and Attention, when the holy Offices began, and particularly, as often as they call'd upon them by the *Oremus*, Let us pray; to dismiss the *Penitents*, *Catechumens*, and *Hearers*, when the holy Eucharist was to begin; to prepare the Altar for it; to receive the Offerings from the People, and carry them to the Priest, or Bishop, who placed them upon the holy Table; to carry the holy Cup about, and, in cases of necessity, the Bread to the Faithful; and when the Communion was done, like the \* *Athenian κήρυκες* at the end of their Sacrifices, to dismiss the People. † It was their Office also to be Directors and Monitors to the Bishop, and Presbyters in the performance of divine Service, and to attend upon ‡ the Person of the Bishop at home, and abroad; to make part of his holy Retinue, and in many things to minister to him. But then, Secondly, as their Office was *servile* in these respects: so it seems to have been *sacerdotal*, as they were Sharers in the lowest degree of the priestly Office, when in virtue of it they were appointed and allowed, especially in the Absence of the Bishops and Presbyters, to administer the most solemn and fœderal Office of Baptism, and offer up Praises, and Supplications, and Thanksgivings, and

\* Haberti Observat. ii. Pars altera, p. 192, 203.

\* *Peraclis vera solemnibus religionis, populum dimittebant his verbis* ΑΛΩΝ ΑΦΕΣΙΣ, *Ex Templo, vel Ite missa est.* J. Casaub. *Animadv. in Athenai, Lib. xiv. p. 594.*

† Habert. *ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.* Observ. iii.

#### 40 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Prayers in the publick Congregations; in the former of which two Offices, as I have observed, the Deacon stands on God's part to admit the Candidates of Baptism into the Church; and in the latter on the Peoples part, as their Orator, to put up their united Prayers, and in both acts as a Priest. For which reason, perhaps it was that St. *Ignatius* said, That *they were not Ministers of Meats and Drinks, but of the Church of God*; that is, they are not only Ministers of Tables, to <sup>a</sup> serve at which they were first appointed, <sup>b</sup> as St. *Hierom* observes, but also sacerdotal Ministers, Ministers of God, and the Church, Ministers of the Mysteries of Jesus Christ; to whom, saith he in another way of speaking, is committed the Ministry of Jesus Christ. So the <sup>c</sup> Council of *Eliberis* in the Year 362. decreed that in case of Necessity a Deacon might absolve dying Penitents, or excommunicates, if the Bishop commanded him. And this Power of reconciling Penitents in imminent danger of Death when a Priest cannot be had, was granted to Deacons by the Church in succeeding Ages, as is shew'd in many Instances by a late learned <sup>d</sup> Writer, and Monk of the *Benedictine* Order, to whom I refer the Reader. And before this in the Church of *Africa* <sup>e</sup> Deacons were allow'd to receive Confessions, and absolve Penitents, when neither the Bishop, nor any Presbyter could be present, as is plain from the

---

<sup>a</sup> Acts vi. 2, 3.

<sup>b</sup> *Viduarum & Mensarum Ministri*, Epist. ad Evagrium 85.

<sup>c</sup> Can. 32.

<sup>d</sup> Edm. Martene de *Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, Lib. i. pars ii. p. 37.

<sup>e</sup> *Si incommodo aliquo, & infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata presentia nostra, apud Presbyterum quemque presentem, vel si Presbyter repertus non fuerit, & urgere exitus coeperit, apud Diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint, ut manu eis in penitentia imposita, veniant ad Dominum cum pace.* Cyprian. Edit. Oxon. Epist. XVIII.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 41

place in the Margin. Upon which *Rigaltius* favouring the Opinion of *Optatus*, saith, *Est enim etiam in Diaconatu Sacerdotium*, there is something of Priesthood in the Deacon's Office. But as learned a Man, the Annotator in the *Oxford* Edition, is of Opinion, that the Deacons did not perform these sacerdotal Acts, as Priests in virtue of their Office, or as Sharers of the Priesthood, but only as deputed by the Authority of the Bishops in extraordinary cases of necessity, when there were no Bishops, or Presbyters to perform them. *Habertus* in his V<sup>th</sup> Observation on the Greek Pontifical is of this Opinion, and there likewise shews, that anciently Deacons never were permitted to preach *è cathedra*, in a solemn and sacerdotal manner; that is, <sup>f</sup> as Messengers, or Ambassadors of Christ, by whom God did instruct them, and exhort them to repent, and who, in Christ's stead, our great High-Priest in Heaven, pray'd them to be reconciled to God. Sir, my Undertaking doth not oblige me to arbitrate between these Opinions, but only to shew, that it is more consonant to the Notion of Priesthood to think Deacons to be Priests of the lowest Form who had not power to offer, than to deny the more noble Orders of Bishops and Presbyters to be *truly* sacerdotal; because to administer Baptism, and officiate in publick Prayers, properly speaking, seem to be sacerdotal Acts in them, as well as in the Presbyters, tho' they could not administer the Holy Eucharist, and by consequence it is far from being true that Bishops, and Presbyters are not proper Priests, upon supposition that the Christian Religion hath neither Altar, nor Sacrifice of any sort, as the *Jewish* neither now hath, nor formerly in the Captivity had.

I say, upon supposition, which for Argument sake I am willing to grant your *late Writer*, though in

---

<sup>f</sup> 2 Cor. v. 20.

## 42 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

reality it hath both, as I now proceed to shew, from the Writings of the New Testament; and thereby prove that the Ministers of Christ are so far from not being proper Priests, that they are proper Altar-Ministers, or Sacrificing Priests, τὰ ἱερεῖα ἱεραζόμενοι, as the Apostle calls the Jewish Priests.

VIII. I will begin with the twenty third and twenty fourth Verses of the fifth Chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel: *If thou bring<sup>e</sup> thy Gift unto the Altar, and there remembrest that thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift.* The original Word for GIFT is a sacrificial Term of a general Signification, and denotes a material Sacrifice, or Offering of any sort, as may be seen in the Margin<sup>b</sup>, and therefore it is to be taken here in that sense, in which it is to be understood in Matthew viii. 4. *Shew thy self to the Priest, and offer the GIFT [or Oblation] that Moses commanded.* So in Chapter xxiii. 18. *Whosoever shall swear by the Altar it is nothing, but whosoever sweareth by the GIFT, that is upon it, he is guilty.* In this sense of the Word our Lord spake to the Jews in their common Language. But then it is to be observed, that those Jews were his Disciples, and that this Precept of Reconciliation was therefore intended by him for an Ordinance of the New Testament,

<sup>e</sup> Τὸ Δῶρον Ἐ.

<sup>b</sup> *Levit. i. 2.* If any of you bring an Offering to the Lord, Πρεσβύταις Δῶρα τῶ κυεῖω. Ye shall bring your Offering of the Cattel of the Herd, and of the Flock, Ἀπὸ τῶ κτήνων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶ βοῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶ προβάτων προσοίσει τὰ ΔΩΡΑ ὑμῶν. V. 3. If his Offering be Burnt-Sacrifice, Ἐὰν ὀλοκαύτωμα τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ. Chap. ii. 1. When any will offer a Meat-Offering unto the Lord, his Offering shall be of fine Flour, Ἐὰν ᾖ ψυχὴ προσφύειν Δῶρον θυσίαν τῶ κυεῖω σιμίδαις ἔσαι τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ. V. 7. If thy Oblation be a Meat-Offering baken in Pan, Ἐὰν ᾖ θυσία ἀπὸ ἑσπερας τὸ δῶρον Ἐ. See also Chap. i. 10, 14. ii. 4, 5, 13. iii. 1.

like



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 43

like many others which he gave his Disciples, while he instructed them in the Doctrines relating to the Kingdom of God. Thus he spoke by way of Anticipation of <sup>1</sup> Baptism and baptismal Regeneration to *Nicodemus*, *John* iii. 3, 4, 5. and of the H. <sup>2</sup> Eucharist, *John* vi. 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58. Many other Doctrines, and Precepts of Christian Perfection were given by way of Anticipation for the Gospel-State, which are to be found in his Sermon on the Mount, and other places of the Evangelists : as that, wherein he told his Disciples, that their Righteousness was to exceed the Righteousness of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* ; that of not calling our Brother Fool ; that of not looking upon a Woman with a lustful Eye ; that whereby he forbid Divorce in other places, as well, as in his Sermon ; that of not resisting Evil ; of loving our Enemies ; and of forgiving others their Offences, and Trespasses against us, as a Condition without which God would not forgive us ours against him. To these we may add the special Beatitudes promised to those, who mourn ; to the poor, meek, and humble in Spirit ; and to those who are reviled, and persecuted for his sake. All which were given to them, as well as the Precept of being reconciled, before they offer'd at the Altar, as to his Disciples, and for the future Christian Church, to renew the divine Likeness, and Image in

---

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian. de Orat. Domin. Homo novus, renatus, & Deo per ejus gratiam restitutus PATER primo in loco dicit quia filius esse jam cepit. See Epist. lxxii. Nisi quis renatus fuerit, &c. p. 190. Epist. lxxiii. p. 207, 208. adversus Judæos, xii. p. 24. Testim. lib. iii. xxiv. p. 72. Concil. Carthag. 231.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Ipso predicante, & monente, Ego sum panis vite, qui de celo descendi. Si quis ederit de meo pane, vivet in æternum. Panis autem, quem ego dedero, caro mea est pro seculi vita, &c. See also Adversus Judæos, lib. i. p. 29. Testim. lib. 3. p. 72. Tertul. de Orat. PANEM NOSTRUM, &c. Spiritualiter potius intelligamus, Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus, & vita panis. Ego sum, inquit, panis vita, & paulo supra.

#### 44 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

us, and make us partakers of the divine Perfections by conforming our Lives, and our whole Selves to his Instructions, and Will. And as the Primitive Church conceived this Precept of Reconciliation to be intended among those I have mentioned for a Gospel-Precept, so they always applied it to the *Eucharist*, as the Gospel-Sacrifice, or Oblation, not thinking (as Mr. Mede well observes) that our Lord would make a New Law, or let me add inforce an old one concerning Legal Sacrifices, which he was presently to abolish, but that it had reference to that Oblation which was to be instituted by him for the Gospel-Dispensation, and to continue with, and under it for ever. Thus in the *1 Apost. Const.* *Εάν προσφέρῃς τὸ Δῶρον ἑς. If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembrest thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave thy Gift there, and go thy way, first, and be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift.* Δῶρον ὃ ἐστὶ Θεῷ ἢ ἐκείνῃ προσδύχῃ καὶ εὐχαριστία, *For the Gift that is offered to God is every ones Prayer, and Thanksgiving.* What immediately follows in Chapter xlv shews, That this relates to the Eucharist, Διὰ τὸτο οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι, μελλόντων ὑμῶν εἰς προσδύχην ἀπαντᾶν, &c. *Wherefore O Bishops, when you proceed to Prayer, after the Lesson, and singing of Psalms, and expounding the Scriptures, let the Deacon standing near you proclaim with a loud Voice, Let no Man have ought against his Brother, let no dissembler come hither, that if any Persons are guilty of any thing for which they ought to ask Forgiveness; they may pray unto God, and be reconciled to their Brethren.* In this last Citation, which continues the former, the very Order of the Liturgy, or Eucharistical Service is described, as it is mentioned in *Justin the Martyr's* first Apology, and partly set forth in the same *Const. Apost.* lib. vii.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 45

cap. 12. and 13. And I cannot but observe, that it hath the air of a true, and most genuine Passage worthy of that Apostolical Father, who as I have more than once noted, in his first Epistle to the Cor. §. xlv. calls Bishops *προσέτακτες τὰ Δῶρα*, *offerers of the Gifts*. These Gifts of Bread, and Wine, which the People brought and the Priests offered, they frequently called *ΑΓΙΑ ΑΩΠΑ*, to distinguish them from the other Oblations; as of the First-Fruits of Corn, and Grapes, which were also presented to God upon the Altar. But to return to St. Clement, he virtually applies this Text to the Eucharistical Sacrifice, *Apost. Constit.* lib. II. cap. lvi. where the Order of the *Liturgy* is more fully described, than in the liii and liv Chapters; After Prayer, saith he, let some of the Deacons attend only to the Oblation of the Eucharist, ministering to the Body of the Lord with fear: Let others look after the People and make them keep Silence. But let the Deacon that assists the Bishop say, *μὴ τις κατὰ τινος*, let no Man have ought against his Brother, let no Dissembler come here. Then let the Men salute the Men, and the Women the Women with a holy Kiss, but not treacherously, like Judas, who betray'd the Lord with a Kiss. After this, let the Deacon pray for the universal Church, and the whole World—— Then let the Bishop give the PEACE to the People, and bless them, as Moses commanded the Priests to bless the People in these words: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee, &c. Then let the Bishop pray, and say: O Lord, save thy People, and bless thine Inheritance which thou hast "purchased as a peculiar People, with the precious Blood of thy Christ, and called a Royal Priesthood, and a Holy Nation. After this *ἤτοι δὲ ἡ θυσία*, let the Sacrifice be done, the People standing, and praying silently, *καὶ ὅταν ἀνεέλθῃ*, and when the Oblation is fini-

¶ Numb. vi. 24.

¶ Ἡμετέρας προνοίας.

## 46 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

shew let every Order by its self receive the Lord's Body, and precious Blood orderly, with Reverence, and Fear, as coming to the Body of a King; and let the Women come as it becomes them, with covered Heads [or Veils], and let the Doors be kept that no Infidel, or uninitiated Person enter.

To the same Eucharistical Oblation is this Text applied by *Ireneus*, lib. 4. cap. 34. *Igitur Ecclesia oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, &c.* Therefore this Oblation of the Church, which the Lord [° by his Prophet *Malachi*] commanded to be offered through all the World, is accounted a pure Sacrifice with God, and is accepted by him; not that he needs any Sacrifice from us, but because he that offers is himself honoured in what he offers, if his Offering is accepted: For Honour and Affection is shewed to a King by <sup>p</sup> a Gift; which our Lord being willing that we should offer in all Simplicity and Innocency, commanded, saying; *When thou bringest thy Gift unto the Altar, and there remembrest, that thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave thy Gift before the Altar, and go, and be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come, and offer thy Gift.* This Father also alludes to this Text at the latter end of this Chapter, in these words: *Sicut & ideo nos offerre vult munus ad Altare frequenter sine intermissione.* And so much for the Sense of this Text, according to the Disciple of St. *John*.

The next Father who useth this Text, is *Tertullian*, de *Patientia*, cap. 12. *Nemo convulsus animum in fratrem suum munus apud Altare perficiet, nisi prius reconciliando fratri reversus ad patientiam fuerit.* No Man who hath a rancorous Mind against his Brother, shall offer his Gift at the Altar, unless he returns to Patience, and is first reconciled to his Brother. In this allusion to the Text, the Father must take the word

° Ibid. Cap. xxxiii.

<sup>p</sup> Per munus.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 47

*Gift and Altar* in the literal Sense, for which I have produced it; I mean, for the Eucharistical Offering at the Holy Table, which was the Sense of the Church in his Time, as may be proved from his Writings. But without citing any of them here, it is evident from his phrase *MUNUS PERFICERE*, which is a sacrificial Expression borrowed from the Greek Writers both sacred, and profane, among whom ἱερὸν τελεῖν, θυσίαν τελεῖν, and τελεῖν put by it self, signifies *Rem sacram facere*, to offer Sacrifice, and so *munus perficere* must signify to offer the Eucharistical Gift, or Oblation, as he calls it *de Prescript.* *Har.* cap. 40. Where speaking of *MITHRA*, the Persian Goddess, who aped the Mysteries of the Christian Religion, *Tingit*, saith he, she baptizes, & celebrat panis oblationem, and hath a Sacrifice of Bread. So *de Oratione*, cap. 10. Ne prius ascendamus ad *Dei Altare*, quam si quid discordiæ, vel offensiæ cum fratribus contraxerimus, resolvamus. *Let us*

---

\* See *Julius Pollux*, lib. 1. p. 35. *Budaus's Comment.* Græcæ Linguæ. *Constantius Lexicon.* *Hen. Steph. Thesaur.* Græcæ Linguæ. So *Chrysost.* *Hom.* lxxxiii. in cap. xxvi. *Match.* Ἐπεὶ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τινὲς Σύμβολα τῶ τελείωσιν; si vero mortuus non est Christus, cujus Symbola he Oblationes, If Christ died not, of what, (or whom) are the Oblations, the Symbols, or Signs? Which makes me think, that *TETEΛΕΣΤΑΙ*, the last Word which our Lord spake as he expired upon the Cross, relates in its sacrificial Sense to his Passion; as the grand Sacrifice of our Redemption, where it was finished, and our Redemption thereby accomplished. The Word is so used by *Casillas* of the Holy Eucharist, *Liturg. Exposit.* cap. xxvi. Τέτων ὃ ἐργαζόμενον τὸ πᾶν τὴν ἱεραργίας ἡρῶσαι, & τετέλεσαι. And from this signification of the Verb *τελεῖν*, and the verbal Noun *τέλειν* for a Sacrifice or Oblation, the Prayer of Oblation is called *τῆς τελειᾶς ὁ χῆν*. And the latter Greeks call the Holy Spirit, which the ancient Church in all places pray'd unto God to send down upon Oblations, *τῆς τελειᾶς ὁ χῆν*, & *ἐκκλησιαστικὸν πνεῦμα*, as *B. Samonas* in his Disceparation with *Achmed* a Mahumentan Saracen, in which as all the latter Greeks after the second Council of Nice, but more especially after the Tenth Century, he went most absurdly to prove, that the Bread and Wine by Consecration was made the true and real Body and Blood of Christ.

## 48 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

not come unto God's Altar, before we have removed all Differences, or Offences we had contracted with our Brethren. What he calls *Altare Dei* here, he, who uses *Ara*, and *Altare* promiscuously, which other Latin Fathers distinguish, he, I say, calls *Aram Dei* in cap. 14. *Similiter & stationum diebus non putant plerique Sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto Corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit. An magis Deo obligat? Nonne solennior erit statio tua si ad Aram Dei steteris.*

The next Father, who applies this Text to the Christian Sacrifice is St. Cyprian. Saith he in his Tract of Church-Unity, *Ad Sacrificium cum dissensione venientem revocat ab Altari, & jubet prius concordare cum fratre, tunc cum pace redeuntem munus offerre, quia nec ad Cain munera respexit Deus: neque enim peccatum Deum habere poterat, qui cum fratre pacem per zeli discordiam non habebat.* Him that comes to the Sacrifice with dissention [our Lord] repulses from the Altar, and commands him first to agree with his Brother, and then returning in peace to offer his Gift, because God had no respect to the offering of Cain, &c. After citing so many Testimonies out of this Father for the Eucharistical Oblation, I conceive it needless to prove what he meant by *Sacrificium*, and *munus offerre* in this place, where he compares the Offering of unreconciled Christians at the Holy Communion, and the Offering of Cain together. There is more to the same purpose in his Treatise of the Lord's Prayer on the fifth Petition, *Sic nec sacrificium Deus recipit dissidentis & ab Altari revertentem prius fratri reconciliari jubet, ut pacificis precibus & Deus possit esse pacatus. Sacrificium Deo Majus est pax nostra, & fraterna concordia— neque enim in sacrificia qua Abel & Cain primi obtulerunt, munera eorum Deus, sed Corda intuebatur— Abel pacificus & justus dum Deo sacrificat innocenter docet, & Cæ-*  
teros,

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 49

teròs, quando ad Altare munus offerunt sic venire, &c. Here again is a comparison of Sacrifice to Sacrifice, Altar to Altar, and Gift to Gift; and *Abel* set forth as an Example to us, when we offer our Gifts at the Altar, *Venire cum Dei timore, cum simplici corde, cum lege justitiæ, cum concordia pace.* So at the latter end of his Tract *de zelo, & livore*: *Dimittentur tibi debita, quando ipse dimiseris: accipientur sacrificia tua, cum pacificus ad Deum veneris: Thy Sins shall be forgiven, when thou dost forgive, and thy Sacrifices shall be accepted, when thou comest to God in peace.*

*Eusebius de vita Constant.* Lib. iv. cap. xli. speaking of the great Synod, which the Emperor caused to assemble at Tyre for composing some Dissensions, which had arisen in the Church, *He thought it not lawful, saith he, for those who had Dissensions in their minds against one another to come to the holy Worship [of the Eucharist], because the Law of God commanded, that those who had differences should not offer the Gifts, before they had returned to mutual Friendship, and were united in Peace.* And what *Eusebius* thought of the Holy Eucharist may be seen in cap. xlv. of the same Book, and *de Laud. Const.* cap. xvi. p. 544. B.

Μὴ ἐξέρχαι ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ παρεῖναι λατρείαν. Suicerus. in The-  
saur. Eccl. λατρεία strictè Eucharistia Celebrationem denotat.

Οἱ ὃν θυσίας ἀναμύσους, καὶ μυστικαῖς τελεγεῖαις τὸ θεῖον  
ἐκδοκῶσι.

Ἀνάμυς καὶ λοφικὰς θυσίας τὰς δι' ἐνυχῶν καὶ ἀπορρήτων θεολο-  
γίας τοῖς αὐτοῖς διασώτῃσι, τίς ἐπιθῆναι παρέδωκεν ἄλλῳ; ἢ  
μόνον ὁ ἡμέτερος Ἰωάννης; διὸ ἐπὶ τῷ καθ' ὅλης ἀνθρώπων  
οἰκουμενῇ, θυσιασθεῖα συνίστην, ἐκκλησιῶν τε ἀπορρώματα νο-  
τῶν τε καὶ λοφικῶν θυσίων ἱερατικαῖς τελεγεῖαις, μόνον πᾶσι πα-  
τριαρχαῖς, ἐκκλησίαις ἀποστόλοις καὶ ἐκκλησίαις ἀναμύσους τὰς δι'  
αἱμάτων καὶ λύβρων, καὶ πᾶσι προσεπιγινώσκας θυσίας τὰς τε  
ὡμας κείνας, καὶ μαρτυρίας ἀνδροκλασίας τε, καὶ ἀνθρωποθυσίας,  
τίς ἀφ' αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων δίδωμι, ἑσθλῶς, καὶ μηκέτι ὑπέ-  
ρχων παρεσθλάσιν; ὡς μαρτυροῦντες πρὸς αὐτῆς γε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ  
ἰσοτέας.

## 50 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

To these Testimonies I shall add that of Cyril of Jerusalem, as I have cited it in my Preface to the *Second Collection of Controversial Letters*, p. liv. The *μή τις καὶ τινος*, and the *Holy Kiss of Peace* were founded on this Text, as requiring a new Qualification for the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, according to this holy Father, *Cat. myst. cap. 5.* εἶτα βοᾷ ὁ διάκονος ἀλλήλους ὑπολάβετε, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπαζήβητα, &c. Then the Deacon cries aloud, embrace one another, and let us kiss one another: but do not think this Kiss to be like to those, which are commonly us'd in other Salutations; for it is not such: but this Kiss reconciles Souls, and is a Pledge of Amnesty and Forgiveness, a Sign that there is a commixture of Souls, and a perfect obliteration of all Injuries; and for this reason it was, that Christ said, if thou bringest thy Gift unto the Altar, &c. Wherefore this Kiss is reconciliatory, and consequently holy, as St. Paul said, Salute you one another with a holy Kiss.

The next Author, who took the Bread and Wine to be the Gifts, or Offerings of this Text in a proper and literal sense, is St. Chrysostom, in his Commentary upon the Place. Δια τοῦτο ἐν εἰπε μὲν τὸ ΠΡΟΣΕΝΕΓΚΕΙΝ ἢ, πρὶν ἢ Προσενεγκεῖν· ἀλλ' αὐτῷ καὶ ΔΟΠΟΤ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΤ καὶ τὸ ΘΥΣΙΑΣ ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος πρὶν διδωσθαι τὸ δόξασαι. For which reason he did not say after thou hast offer'd, or before thou offerest, but when the Gift is laid [upon the Altar], and the Sacrifice ready to begin, then he sends the Offerer, to be reconcil'd to his Brother. Οὐ γὰρ καὶ λέγουσιν μὴ πρὸ πρὶν προσενεγκεῖν, ὥς ἂν καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ μὴ ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὸ πρὶν αἰσάνην, ὅτι γὰρ τὸ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀτίθεσθαι ἐπεχόμενος δόξασθαι πρὸς τὸ δελυπημένον, καὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔχοντος. For he that is commanded not to offer, before he is reconcil'd, tho' not to gain the Love of his Brother, yet at least

" Hom. xvi. in cap. v. Matth.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 51

that his Sacrifice may be rightly offer'd, he is enjoin'd to run to his offended Brother, and put an end to the enmity, which is between them εἶπω γὰρ ὁ Χρῆς ὅτι ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ μίχρην ὑποψιδεῖται, ἵνα μὴ τὸ θυσιᾶς πλεονεκτήσῃς βαθυμύτερον ὁ τοιοῦτος γλῆν, ἡμέραν ἢ ἡμέρας ἀνα-  
 ἑσθ' ὁμοῦ. So Christ does not allow [the Offerer] the least delay, lest the Sacrifice being ended, he should become backward in his Duty by putting it off from day to day. Εἰπὼν γὰρ ἄφες τὸ δῶρον σε, ἐκ ἔστη μέχρι τέ-  
 τε· ἀλλ' ἐπήλασεν· ἔμπροσθεν τῆ θυσιαστηρίης, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆ τοῦ παλιν εἰς φρονίω αὐτὸν ἐμειδῶν, καὶ ἀπ' ἑθι, ἀλλὰ προσέθηκε, προσέτον, καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν προσέφερε τὸ δῶρον (καὶ ὅτι πάντων τῶν ὀφειλῶν, ὅτι ἐξ ὀφείλει) τὰς ἀπεχθῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐχθρίας αὐτῇ ἢ τράπεζα. Ἀκκέτωρ δὲ μεμνημένοι, ὅσοι μὲν ἐχθρὰς προσέτερον· ἀκκέτωρ καὶ οἱ ἀμύνοντες· καὶ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐχέει τι κοινὸν ὁ λόγος. προσάσσει γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ δῶρον καὶ θυσίαν, εὐχὴν λέγω καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην· ὅτι γὰρ καὶ τὸτο θυσία, ἀκκσον τί φησιν ὁ προσφῆτης· θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με, καὶ πάλιν· θυ-  
 σον τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως· καὶ, ἔπαρσις τῇ χειρὶ μου θυσία ἑωρεμένη· ὥς καὶ ἂν εὐχὴν μὲν τοιαύτης γνώμης προσάγῃς βέλτιον ἀφαινεῖν ἢ εὐχῇ, καὶ ὅτι τὴν καλῶματὴν ἐλθεῖν τῇ ἀδ' ὁφείλει, καὶ τότε ἢ εὐχὴν προσφέρειν. For ha-  
 ving said, leave thy Gift, he did not stop there, but added, before the Altar, giving him an Impression of Horror from the place, and go thy way; nor does he only say, go thy way, but adds, first, and then come and offer thy Gift; giving us to understand by all this, that this Table does not receive such as are at enmity with each other. Let those hear this, who being initiated into (these) holy Mysteries approach [the Altar] with enmity, and let those also hear, who are not yet initiated; for this Text has some relation also to them: for they also bring a Gift, and a Sacrifice, I mean Prayer, and Alms; \* for these are a Sacrifice also,

\* Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ τὸτο θυσία, quia enim & hac sacrificii instar ob-  
 tineant.

## 52 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

hear what the Prophet saith: the Sacrifice of Praise honoureth me, and again; offer unto God the Sacrifice of Praise, and the lifting up of my hands as the Evening-Sacrifice. Here the Father distinguishes between the Sacrifice of the *Baptized*, and *Unbaptized* Christians; between the Sacrifice of the Altar, and the Sacrifice of those, who were not yet qualified to come to the Altar; between the mere oral Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, and the real Sacrifice or Oblation of the Bread, and Wine with Praise, and Thanksgiving; between Sacrifice in the most eminent proper sense for an external material Sacrifice presented unto God at the Altar, and Sacrifice only in the less proper, and analogical sense for Praise, and Thanksgiving, and Alms, as it is in our, and all other Translations of the last \* place cited by the Father: *Let my Prayer be set forth before Thee as the Incense, and the lifting up of the Hands, as the Evening-Sacrifice.* These Words were spoken by King David, when he was in Exile from Jerusalem, and the Temple, where Morning, and Evening-Sacrifices were offered, instead of which he begs of God, that he would be pleased to accept of his Prayers, that like the daily Sacrifices, they might come up for a Memorial unto him.

To these let me add the Testimonies of *Hierom*, and *Augustin*, the former of whom in his Commentary of *Matth*, v. writes thus: *Non dixit si Tu, &c. He doth not say if thou hast any thing against thy Brother, but if thy Brother hath any thing against Thee, that a greater necessity of being reconciled to him may be imposed upon thee.* For as long as we are not able to pacify him, I know not if we can warrantably offer our Gifts to God. The latter in his xvith Sermon de *verbis Domini* writes thus. *Si obuleris munus tuum ad Altare, &c. God is not angry with thee for deferring*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 53

to present thy Gift, for he desireth Thee more than thy Gift. For if having an evil mind against thy Brother, thou shalt come with thy Gift to God, he will answer thee: what hast thou brought to me to thy own destruction? Thou offerest thy Gift, when thou thy self art not a fit Offering to God. Christ values thee more, whom he hath redeemed with his Blood, than what thou foundest in thy Store-house. Therefore leave thy Gift before the Altar, and go, and be first reconciled to thy Brother, and then come, and offer thy Gift. See how soon the danger of Hell is taken away: not reconciled thou art in danger of Hell, but when thou art reconciled thou securely offerest thy Gift at the Altar. Here St. *Augustin* takes the Text in the literal sense. So likewise *de Serm. Dom. in Monte.* he understands it literally: <sup>†</sup> if the offended Brother be present; \* but if he be absent, as perhaps beyond the Sea, then he thinks in that case it may be taken in a spiritual Sense for any spiritual Gift, as Prayer, or Praise, and for the spiritual Altar of the Heart, which is in the inner Temple of the Body as it is written, *The Temple of God is holy, which Temple ye are, and that Christ may dwell in your Hearts by Faith.*

VII. The next scriptural Proof, which I shall produce in order for the Eucharistical Oblation of the Bread and Wine, is taken from the Words of the Institution, *Matth. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19.* recited by the Apostle in these words. *The Lord Jesus in the same Night that he was betrayed, took Bread, and when he had given Thanks he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my Body which is broken for you: This DO in remembrance of me.*

---

<sup>†</sup> Si præsens frater fuerit, &c.

\* Si ergo de absente, & quod fieri potest etiam trans mare constituto, aliquid tale veniat in mentem absurdum est credere ante altare munus relinquendum, quod post terras, & mare pererrata offerat Deo.

## 54 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

After the same manner also he took the Cup, when he supped, saying: *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, This DO ye, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me.* That the *Ancients* believed that our Lord made an Oblation of the Bread and Wine at his Institution of this Sacrament, and commanded his Disciples so to do, is past all doubt from the LXIII. Epist. of St. Cyprian to Cecilius, against an evil Custom introduced in some places to offer nothing but Water, without Wine, at the Holy Eucharist. *Quamquam sciam frater charissime, &c.* Although, most dear Brother (saith he) I know that most of the Bishops set over the Churches of the Lord, by divine Mercy through the whole World, do keep the Rule of Evangelical Truth, and of our Lord's command, nor do swerve at all by a mere humane, and new Institution, from what Christ our Master commanded to be done, and did himself: Nevertheless because some through Ignorance, or Simplicity, in consecrating the Cup of our Lord, and distributing it to the People, do not do what Jesus Christ our Lord, and God, the Author and Institutor of this Sacrifice, did and commanded to be done: I thought it necessary to write unto you of this matter, that if any is withheld in this Error, he may by the Light of Truth return unto the original Tradition of our Lord— *Admonitos autem nos scias, &c.* But know that we are commanded in offering the Cup to observe the Ordinance of our Lord, and to do no other thing, than what he first did, [that is to say] that the Cup, which is offered in remembrance of him, be a mixture of Water and Wine. *Nam quis magis sacerdos Dei summi, &c.* For who is more a Priest of the most High God, than our Lord Jesus Christ? who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and the very same Sacrifice that Melchisedeck offered, that is Bread and Wine. *Ut ergo in Genesi, &c.* Therefore as in Genesis the High Priest Melchisedeck might duly bless Abraham, the representation of the Sacrifice of Christ by



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 55

by Bread and Wine was to precede, which our Lord verified, and fulfilled, when he offered Bread, and a Cup of Wine, and Water, which was the plenitude, and verity of that Prefiguration. Sed & per Solomonem, &c. Nay the Holy Ghost by Solomon did not only foreshew the Figure of the Sacrifice of our Lord, to wit<sup>r</sup>, the Oblation of Bread, and Wine, but also made mention of the Altar, and of the Apostles: Wisdom, saith he, hath builded her House, she hath hewn out her seven Pillars, she hath killed her Beasts, she hath mingled her Wine, she hath also furnished her Table. Qua in parte, &c. Where we find that it was a mix'd Cup, which our Lord offered, and that it was Wine, which he called his Blood. Nam si in sacrificio, quod Christus obtulerit, &c. For if none but Christ is to be followed in administering the Sacrifice, which Christ offered, then it is our Duty to obey, and do what Christ did and commanded to be done. Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus, & Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos, &c. For if Jesus Christ our Lord, and God is the High Priest of God the Father, and first offered himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded, that this should be done in remembrance of him, doth not he who doth as Christ did<sup>a</sup>, truly act as a Priest, in the place of Christ; and then offer a true and perfect Sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he offers in the same manner which he may perceive Christ himself offered. Post cœnam mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus; after Supper our Lord offered a mix'd Cup. Et quia Passionis ejus mentionem, &c. And because we commemorate his Passion in all our Sacrifices (for the Passion of our Lord is the<sup>b</sup> Sacrifice we offer) we ought to do nothing but what he did. Re-

<sup>a</sup> Immolata hostia & panis, & vini.

<sup>b</sup> Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur.

<sup>c</sup> Passio est enim Domini] Illius Ἀνάμνησις. Luc. xxii. 19.  
1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

## 56 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

ligioni igitur nostræ congruit, &c. Wherefore, dear Brother, it is very agreeable to our Religion, and to the fear we have of God, and to our Order and Priestly Function, that in mixing, and offering the Cup, we strictly observe the Ordinance of our Lord, and by his Authority correct the Errors of others; that when he shall come in his glorious Majesty from Heaven, he may find us holding what he taught, observing what he commanded, and doing what he did. Here is a noble, ample, and plain literal Proof from the Testimony of this Father, and of the whole Church of his Time, that our Lord at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, offered up the Bread and Cup to his Father, and commanded his Disciples in the Ministration of the same Sacrament to do, as he had done. So in the Eucharistical Office, *Const. Apost. lib. 8. cap. 12.* Μεννῦνται τοῖνυν, &c. Being mindful therefore of his Passion, &c. Προσφερόμεν, &c. We offer unto thee our King and God, according to his Commandment, this Bread and this Cup. The same may be proved from the Testimony of Irenæus, who flourished in the second Century, above fourscore Years before St. Cyprian. This Father speaking of the Holy Eucharist, *Lib. 4. cap. 32.* writes thus: Sed & suis Discipulis • dans Consilium primitias Deo offerre, &c. But also authorizing his Disciples to offer to God the first Fruits of his Creatures, — he took the Creature of Bread and gave Thanks, saying, This is my Body, — And in like manner he delivered the Creature of Wine in the Cup, to be his Blood, & *Novi Testamenti novam Docuit oblationem, &c.* and instituted the New Sacrifice of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers to God

---

• The Phrase occurs in the Latin Version, 1 Cor. vii. 25. *Consilium autem do, tanquam misericordiam consecutus a Domino*, in the Greek *τὸν δὲ δίδωμι*. So 2 Cor. viii. 10. & *consilium in hoc do*, in the Greek, *καὶ γὰρ δίδωμι ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι*.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 57

throughout the whole World ; which offering was foretold by the Prophet Malachi <sup>a</sup>, *Non est mihi voluntas in vobis, &c.* I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, &c. So Chap. xxxiv. *Igitur Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, &c.* Therefore this Oblation of the Church, which the Lord appointed to be offered throughout the whole World, is looked upon by God as a pure Sacrifice, and is accepted by him. *Non quod indigeat à nobis Sacrificium, &c.* Not that he needs any Sacrifice from us, but because he that offers it is honour'd in that which he offers, if his Gift be accepted : for by Gifts we shew the Affection and Honour we have for the Emperour : And our Lord commanding us to offer in all Simplicity and Innocence, charg'd us, saying, *When thou bringest thy Gift to the Altar, &c.* So at the latter end of the same Chapter, *Sicut igitur non his indigens, &c.* Therefore as he does not need these Oblations, but would have them perform'd by us for our own sakes, that we might not be without Fruit. So the Word himself hath given his People this command for making these Oblations, though he has no need of them, but that they should learn to serve God : And therefore he would have us offer our Gifts at his Altar frequently, and without ceasing. Therefore there is an Altar and Temple in Heaven, whi-

---

<sup>a</sup>Cap. i. 10, 11 Dr. Grabe. Locum hunc Propheta de Sacrificio corporis & sanguinis Christi in Eucharistiâ, ante Irenæum interpretati sunt Clemens Romanus, Lib. vii. Const. Apostol. cap. 31. Martialis Epist. ad Burdegalenses cap. 3. Justinus M. in Dialogo ( sed Priores duo supposititii sunt ) Postea vero Tertullianus, Lib. iii. contra Marcionem, Cyprianus, Lib. i. adv. Judæos, cap. 16. Chrysost. in Ps. 95: August. Lib. 18. de Civ. D. cap. 35. & Lib. xix. cap. 23. & Lib. i. contra Adversarium Legis, cap. 20. Euseb. Lib. i. de Dem. Evang. cap. ult. Damascen. Lib. iv. c. 14. Petrus cognomento Venerabilis, Lib. i. contra Petrobusianos, & lib. ii. contra Judæos, cap. 3. Imo & qui Christo nomen non dederat, Rabbi Samuel, Parastasi veri Messie ad Rabbi Isaac Magistrum Synagoge Subiulmetæ in Regno Marochiano. cap. 20, & 23. ut impietas sit plusquam Judaica huic interpretationi repugnare.

## 58 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*ther our Prayers and Oblations are directed, as St. John says in the Apocalypse, and the Temple and Tabernacle of God was open'd; for saith he (Cap. xxi. 3.) Behold the Tabernacle of God, in which he dwells with Men.*

It is plain from these Testimonies, how the Primitive Church understood the Words of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and what was their Sense of them, which is very agreeable to the signification of the Word ΠΟΙΕΙΝ, which in profane as well as sacred Writers signifies to offer, as in that Phrased of \* *Herodotus* concerning the *Persians*, "Ανδρῶν τῶν ΜΑΓΩΝ ἔστι νόμος ὅτι Θυσίας ποιέεσθαι· without one of the MAGI it is not lawful for them to offer Sacrifice. In the † precedent Chapter he uses Θυσίας ἑρθεῖν in the same Sense: Οἱ δὲ νομιζέσθαι Διὶ μὲν, ἐν τὰ ὑψηλότερα τῶν ἑρέων ἀναβαίνοντες, Θυσίας ἑρθεῖν. They have a Custom to offer Sacrifices to Jove upon the tops of the highest Mountains. From whence it is evident even from human Writers, that Ποιεῖν as well as ἑρθεῖν is a sacrificial Term: But more especially it is so used in the Septuagints Translation, which all Learned Men know is follow'd by the Writers of the New Testament, even where they recite the Words and Speeches of our Blessed Saviour. In that Translation of the Old Testament ποιέειν signifies the same as ἱεροποιέειν or ἱερουργεῖν, to offer or sacrifice, as קָרַב does in the Hebrew, and FACERE in the vulgar Translation. So *Exod. xxix. 36.* Καὶ τὸ βοχάριον ΠΟΙΗΣΕΙΣ, &c. And thou shalt offer every day a Bullock for a Sin-offering. Et vitulum pro peccato offeres, &c. V. 38. Καὶ ταῦτα ἔστιν, ἃ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τῇ θυσιαστηρίᾳ. Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the Altar. Hoc est quod FACIES in Altari. And v. 39. Τὸν ἁμνὸν τὸ ἕνα ποιήσεις τὸ πρωῒ, καὶ τὸ ἁμνὸν τὸ δεύτερον ποιήσεις τὸ

\* Lib. I. cap. cxxxii.

† Lib. I. cap. cxxxi.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 59

δειλινόν: *The one Lamb thou shalt offer in the Morning, and the other Lamb thou shalt offer at Even. And*  
 v. 41. Καὶ τὸ ἄμνόν τ' ὀψιμέρον ποιήσεις τὸ δειλινόν;  
*And the other Lamb thou shalt offer at Even: Alterum*  
*verò agnum offeres ad vesperam. So Exod. x. 25.*  
 Καὶ εἶπε Μωϋσῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ (ὅς) δώσεις ἡμῖν ὀλοκαυτώμα-  
 τα καὶ θυσίας, ἃ ποιήσομεν κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. *And*  
*Moses said, thou must give us also Sacrifices and Burnt-*  
*offerings, which we may Sacrifice unto the Lord our God.*  
 Ait Moyſes, hostias quoque & holocausta dabis no-  
 bis, quæ offeramus Domino nostro. *So Leviticus iv.*  
 29. Καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸ μόσχον, ὃν τρέπον ἐποίησεν τὸ μόσχον  
 τὸ τ' ἁμάρτίας, ἕτω ποιηθήσεται: *Et faciet vitulum quem-*  
*admodum fecerat vitulum qui peccati: sic fiet. In*  
*English thus; And he shall offer the Bullock as he*  
*offer'd the Bullock for a Sin-offering; so shall it be*  
*offer'd. Where our English translation uses the*  
*Word DO in a sacrificial Sense. Castalio in his Claf-*  
*sical Latin renders it thus. Tauro facito item, uti fa-*  
*ciet tauro piaculari, Levit. vi. 22. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ Χει-*  
*ρὸς ὁ ἀντὶ αὐτῶ ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ αὐτῶ ποιήσῃ αὐτῷ. And the*  
*Priest of his Sons that is anointed in his stead shall of-*  
*fer it. Offeret autem eam, &c. Levit. ix. 7. Καὶ*  
*εἶπε Μωϋσῆς τῷ Αἰσὺν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν πρὸς τὸ θυσιάσῃ αὐτὸν,*  
*καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸ πρὸς τὸ ἁμάρτίας (καὶ καὶ τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα (καὶ*  
*καὶ ἐξίλασαι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, καὶ τὸ οἶκον (καὶ καὶ ποιήσῃ τὰ*  
*δῶρα τῷ λαῷ, καὶ ἐξίλασαι πρὸς αὐτοῖς, καθάπερ ἐνετείλα-*  
*το κύριος τῷ Μωϋσῇ. And Moses said unto Aaron, go*  
*unto the Altar, and offer thy Sin-offering, and thy*  
*Burnt-offering, and make an Atonement for thy self*  
*and for the People: and offer the Offering of the Peo-*  
*ple, and make an Atonement for them, as the Lord*  
*commanded: Et dixit ad Aaron, accede ad Altare,*  
*& immola pro peccato tuo, offer holocaustum, & de-*  
*precare pro te & pro populo: cumque mactaveris*  
*hostiam populi, ora pro eo, sicut præcepit Domi-*  
*nus. So verse 16. Καὶ προσέειπεν τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα, καὶ*  
*ἐποίησεν αὐτό, ὡς κατένευ: And he brought the Burnt-*  
*offering*

## 60 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

offering and offer'd it, according to the manner. And verse 22. Καὶ κατέβη ποιήσας τὸ ὄψι τῆ ἀμύβλιας, &c. And came down from offering the Sin-offering. Completis hostiis pro peccato, descendit. So Chapter xiv. 19. Καὶ ποιήσῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ ὄψι τῆ ἀμύβλιας, &c. And the Priest shall offer the Sin-offering. Et faciet sacrificium pro peccato. And verse 30. Καὶ ποιήσῃ μίαν ὀπὸ τῆ τευγόνων, &c. And he shall offer the one of the Turtle Doves, &c. Et turturem offeret. Chapter xvii. Ὡς ποιήσῃ αὐτὸ εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα, &c. To offer an offering, &c. Obtulerit oblationem. And ver. 9. Μὴ ἐλίσχει ποιήσαι αὐτὸ τῷ κυρίῳ. And brings it not, &c.—to offer it unto the Lord. Non adduxerit eam, ut offeratur Domino. Chapter xxiii. 12. Καὶ ποιήσετε——— πρῶτον ἀμώμον ἐνιαύσιον, &c. And ye shall offer———an He Lamb without blemish of the first Year, &c. Cedetur agnus immaculatus anniculus, &c. Dent. xvi. 1. Φύλαξαι τὴν μῆνα τῆ νέων, καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ πάσχα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ (s. Observe the Month of Abid, and keep the Passover unto the Lord thy God, that is, sacrifice the Passover, as in the next Verse. So the Latin. Observa mensem novarum frugum, ut facias PHASE Domino tuo. Which place Mr. Ainsworth glosses thus: Thou shalt do or make, that is, celebrate the Feast of the Passover, or sacrifice the Passover. So 1 Kings viii. 64. Ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ ὁλοκαύτωσιν, &c. There he offered Burnt-offerings. Fecit quippe holocaustum ibi. And Chapter xviii. 23. Καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸ εἶν τῶ ἄλλον: in our Language, And I will offer the other Bullock, as in the Latin, & ego faciam Bovem alterum; or as Castalio, Alterum ego immolabo. So verse 25. Ἐκλέξαθε ἐαυτοῖς τὸ μῆλον τὸ ἓνα, καὶ ποιήσατε ὡς ὅροι, &c. in English, Choose you one Bullock for your selves and offer it first; as in the Latin, Eligite vobis Bovem unum & facite primi. And verse 26. Καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ μῆλον καὶ ἔποιον, καὶ ἐπεκατένεον, &c. in English, And they took the Bullock, and offered it, and call'd upon the name of Baal; as the Latin, Qui cum

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 61

cum tulissent Bovem — fecerunt & invocabant nomen Baal. Though our translation in these three places render it by the word *dress*, that is, prepare the Sacrifice. So verse 29. Μετάστρε ἀπὸ τοῦ νυῦ, καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμά μου. *Discedite à modò, & ego faciam holocaustum meum.* Which Passage is wanting in the Hebrew, and therefore in ours and the vulgar Translations. So 2 Kings x. 21. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἰς — and Jehu sent through all Israel. Δέξων, &c. ὅτι θυσίαν μεγάλῃν ποιῶ, for I have a great Sacrifice to offer. Which Expression is also wanting both in the Original and in our Translation, and in the Vulgar. So verse 24. Καὶ εἰσῆλθε ποιῆσαι τὰ θυμὰ καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαύτωμα. *And when they went in to offer Sacrifices and Burnt Offerings.* Ingressi sunt igitur ut facerent victimas & holocausta. So verse 25. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς (ὡς ἐλήθε ποιῶν τὸ ὀλοκαύτωμα). *And it came to pass as soon as he had made an end of offering the Burnt-offerings.* Factum est autem cum completum esset holocaustum. So 2 Chron. xxx. 1. Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἑζεκίας, &c. — ἐλθεῖν εἰς οἶκον κυρίου εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ποιῆσαι τὸ Πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ δευτέρῳ Ἰσραὴλ. *And Hezekiah sent, &c. that they should come to the House of the Lord at Jerusalem, to keep (that is, to offer) the Passover unto the Lord God of Israel:* As in the Latin, *Ut venirent & facerent pascha Domino Deo Israel.* And verse 2. Καὶ ἐβλάτιστο ὁ βασιλεὺς, &c. ποιῆσαι τὸ Πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ μὲν τῷ δευτέρῳ, *For the King had taken Counsel (or decreed,) to keep (or offer) the Passover in the second Month.* Decreverunt ut facerent pascha mense secundo. Chapter xxxv. 1. Καὶ ἐποίησεν Ἰωσίας τὸ Πάσχα τῷ κυρίῳ. *Moreover Josiah kept (or offer'd) a Passover unto the Lord.* Fecit autem Josias — pascha Domino. And Ezra vi. 19. Καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ Πάσχα. *And the Children of the Captivity kept the Passover.* Fecerunt autem filii Israel transmigrationis, Pascha, &c. So Numb. ix. 2. Καὶ ποιή-  
τω

## 62 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

τωξ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ πάχα καὶ ὥρον αὐτῶ, *Let the Children of Israel also keep the Passover at its appointed season*: Faciant filii Israel phase in tempore suo. So Joshua v. 10. Καὶ ἐποίηξ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸ πάχα. *And the Children of Israel kept the Passover*, — Filii Israel — fecerunt phase. So 2 Kings xxiii. 21. Καὶ ἐνέειλάτο ὁ βασιλεὺς — λέγων ποιήσατε πάχα τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν. *And the King commanded, — saying, keep the Passover unto the Lord your God*: Et præcepit — dicens facite phase Domino Deo vestro. See the same Phrase concerning the Sacrifice of the Passover, 2 Chron. xxxv. 17, 18, 19. and in 1 Esdras 1. 6. Καὶ ποιήσατε τὸ πάχα κατὰ τὸ πρῶταγμα τοῦ κυρίου. *Keep (offer) the Passover according to the Commandment of the Lord*. Here I must not omit Psal. lxvi. 15. where *I will offer unto thee Burnt-offerings*, is in the Hebrew, *I will DO*; which the LXXII render by Ἀνοίσω, just as in Exod. xxix. 36. above cited, what is in our Translation, *Thou shalt offer every day a Bullock for a Sin offering* is in the Hebrew פָּעַל, in the Greek ΠΟΙΗΣΕΙΣ, and in the Latin FACIES, *Thou shalt DO every day a Bullock*, &c. And Mr. Ainsworth writes thus upon the place; MAKE, to wit, ready for Sacrifice, that is, kill, sprinkle the Blood, offer, &c. So on, verse 38. פָּעַל אֶשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה עַל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, Καὶ ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ ποιήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, *Hoc est quod facies in Altari, This is that which thou shalt offer upon the Altar*. So on Exod. x. 25. cited also above: saith he, DO Sacrifice, or offer. The word Sacrifice here understood, is elsewhere expressed: as in 1 Kings xii. 27. And when the word *do*, or *make* is joined with Sacrifices, as in this place, it signifies to offer; as Levit. ix. 7, 22. and xvi. 9. Exod. xxix. 26, 39, 41, 43.

To these Testimonies out of the Old Testament, to shew that DO signifies offer, I think fit to add one more out of a Jewish Hellenistical Writer, Baruch i. 10. Καὶ εἶπαν ἰδοὺ ἀπεστάλαμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀγγέλου



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 63

ἀργύρου—καὶ ποιῆσατε Μάννα, καὶ ἀνοίστατε ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιάζειν χρυσὸν τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. And they said, behold we have sent you Money—and prepare, i.e. offer ye Manna, and offer upon the Altar of the Lord our God. Ecce missimus ad vos pecunias—& facite Manna, & offerte pro peccato ad Aram Domini nostri. The Verb ποιῆν, as I have elsewhere observed, is used for to offer in the New Testament, as Heb. xi. 28. Πιστὶς πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς χυσιν τὸ αἷμα. τ. 28. Through Faith he kept the Passover, and the sprinkling of Blood, otherwise, through Faith he offered the Passover, and the Blood of Sprinkling: Sanguinem effusum. For in the Hellenistical style, the sprinkling of Blood, and the Blood of Sprinkling, or Effusion is the same thing. Fide celebravit pascha & sanguinis effusionem, that is, sanguinem effusum. So 1 Tim. ii. 1. Ποιῆσατε may very well be rendred offered. I exhort therefore that first of all Prayers, &c. be offered for all Men, as it is in the Syriac Version.

The Verb ποιῆν is also used in the Hellenistical Sense to signify offer in the Greek Writers of the Church, particularly where they have occasion to speak of the Holy Eucharist. We find it so used in St. Clement's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, §. xi. οἱ ἐν τοῖς τεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιῶντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτοῖς, those, who offer their Oblations in the appointed times, are accepted, and blessed. In the same Sense Justin Martyr useth the Word in his 1st Apology, ἡ ἐπὶ τὰς προσφορὰς τῆς προσευχῆς τῆς ἀδελφῶν ἀρετῆς καὶ ποιήσεων ὑδατίου, καὶ κραματίου, καὶ στικτοῦ λαβῶν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ὄντων ὅλα τὰ ὀνόματι τῷ ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ παντάμῳ τῷ ἀγίῳ, ἀναπέμψας καὶ ὑμῶν.

---

\* Corruptly for Mincha a Meat-offering. Badvellus. Omnia exemplaria Græca legunt Manna, sed puto cum Beza legendum esse MINCHA. Grotius. Legendum in Græco non MANNA sed MANAA, ita enim ἡ ἱστορία, de qua Lev. ii. vertunt veteris Testamenti interpretes. Idem error & alibi in libros irrepit, ut diximus ad Mark ix. 49.

## 64 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

ῥυσίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς καθιζωσθῆς τέτων παρ' αὐτῆς ἐπὶ πολλοῖς  
 ΠΟΙΕΙΤΑΙ, &c. Then the Bread, and the Cup of  
 Water and Wine is brought to the Bishop, who receiving  
 them, sends up Praise and Glory to the Father of all  
 things through the Name of the Son and Holy Spirit,  
 and offers up a very large Thanksgiving to God for  
 deeming us worthy of these his Creatures, &c. So in  
 his Dialogue with Trypho<sup>i</sup>. Δὴ ἡ τὴ Σεμιδάλεως ὁ  
 πρεσβυτέρῳ, ὃς Ἄνδρες, ἔλεγον, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῆς καθαρῆς ῥομφαίας  
 ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας πρεσφύρατος ἀπαδοθεῖσα, τύπτει ἡν τῆς  
 ἀρετῆς τῆς Εὐχαριστίας, ὅν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς πάσης ἔπα-  
 θεν ὑπὸ τῆς καθαρῆς ῥομφαίας τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρί-  
 ας, Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ΠΟΙΕΙΝ.  
 Sirs, truly, I said, that the Oblation of the Flower  
 commanded<sup>k</sup> to be offered for those who are cleansed  
 from the Leprosy, was a Type of the Eucharistical  
 Bread, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to  
 offer in remembrance of his Passion, which he suffer'd  
 for those, whose Souls are cleansed from all Iniquity.  
 So afterwards in the same Dialogue<sup>l</sup>: ὅτι μὲν ἐν ἡ  
 εὐχαὶ ὁ εὐχαριστίας ὑπὸ τῆς ἀξίῳ ἡρώμῳ, τέλει μόναι  
 ὁ εὐαρίστοι εἰσι τὰς θεῶν δυοῖαι ὁ αὐτὸς Φημι. ταῦτα γὰρ  
 μόναι ἡ χερσιανὸν παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, ἡ ἐπ' ἀνάμνησιν ὁ  
 τρεφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε ἡ ὑγρᾶς, ὅν ἡ ἡ τῆς πάσης ὁ  
 πέπονθε δι' αὐτῆς ὁ θεὸς τῆς θεῶν μέμνη. And in-  
 deed, that Prayers and Thanksgivings made by those  
 that are worthy, are the only perfect and acceptable Sa-  
 crifices to God, I also affirm. But these only the Chri-  
 stians have been taught to offer, in the thankful re-  
 membrance we make to God for our dry and wet  
 Food, in which also a commemoration is made of the  
 Passion, which God [the Son] of God suffer'd by him-  
 self. So in the Epistle which Cornelius Bishop of  
 Rome wrote to Fabius Bishop of Antioch, concerning  
 the wicked Practice of Novatian, who when he ad-

<sup>i</sup> P. 259, 260.

<sup>k</sup> Levit. xiv. 10.

<sup>l</sup> P. 345.

<sup>m</sup> Forsan legendum ὁ ὑδρῶν, vel ὁ θεῶν ὑδρῶν.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 65

ministred the Sacrament to his Followers, made them swear <sup>n</sup> by the Body and Blood of Christ that they would never forsake him, nor return to *Cornelius*, he begins the Narrative in these Words: ΠΟΙΗΣΑΣ ἡδὲ τὰς προφορὰς, καὶ δυνάμεων ἐκάσω τὸ μέγεθος, καὶ ἐπιδιδός τὸτο, ὁμνύειν ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐλογεῖν τὰς ταλαιπώρους ἀνθρώπους ἀναγκάσθαι. The Oblation being offer'd, he dividing to every Communicant his part, at the delivery thereof compels the wretched People to swear, instead of blessing and praising God (viz. by saying Amen. °) So St. Chrysostom upon the Words of the Institution, *Matth.* 26. *Hom.* 83. καὶ πάλιν λέγει ὅτι θανάτου καὶ αἰτίας, τὸ ὡς πολλῶν ἐκχωρήσας εἰς ἄφεσιν αἰματιῶν. καὶ Φησὶ, τὸτο ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ εἰς τὸ ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ἵνα ὡς ἔλαβεν ὁ Ἰσραὴλ τὸν νόμον καὶ ἀφίστησι; καθάπερ ἡδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἐποιεῖτε, Φησὶν, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ σωμάτων. ἔγωγε καὶ τὸτο εἰς ἐμὴν. ἐκεῖνο ἐξεχύθη εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ προπαισίου. τὸτο εἰς ἄφεσιν αἰματιῶν καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἀπάσης. And afterwards he declares the cause of his Death, which is shed for many for the remission of Sins, and saith τὸτο ποιεῖτε, &c. Do (or Offer) this in remembrance of me. You see how he weans and draws them from the Jewish Rites: for, says he, as ἐκεῖνο ἐποιεῖτε, ye offered that in remembrance of the miraculous deliverance from Egypt: so offer this in remembrance of me: that [Blood] was shed was the Preservation of the First-born: this for the remission of the Sins of the whole World. I think I may justify this Translation, because this Father does afterwards bring in our Saviour speaking thus. For this reason I have greatly desir'd to eat this Passover <sup>p</sup> with you, that is to deliver unto you new <sup>q</sup> Rites, and a new Passover, whereby to render you spiritual. And

<sup>n</sup> Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. vi. c. 43.

<sup>o</sup> Ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν λαμβάνοντα τὸ ἄρτον ἐκεῖνον τοῦ ἈΜΗΝ, καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνέκτου πρὸς Κορινθίον λέγει.

<sup>p</sup> Τὸ πάχα τὸτο. <sup>q</sup> Τὰ καινὰ πρᾶγματα καὶ πάχα δεῖναι. this

## 66 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

this Translation also agrees very well with what the same <sup>r</sup> Father says on the Words of the Institution, *Hom.* 27. in *1 Cor.* xi. where he twice calls the Eucharist a Sacrifice, as he called it the Passover before.

From this sacrificial use of the Verb ΠΟΙΕΙΝ in the *Hebrew*, or *Hellenistical* Sense to offer, we have in <sup>r</sup> *Irenæus* this Expression, *dedit præceptum faciendarum oblationum*, which in all likelihood was ἐπολὴν τῆ ποιῆσαι θυσίας παρέδωκεν, or ἐνελεῖν αὐτοῖς ποιῆσαι θυσίας, and in <sup>r</sup> *Tertullian*, who *Gracised* much in his Writings, we find *oblationes facimus* in that famous Passage, so egregiously abused, and perverted by the Writers of the Church of *Rome* to justify their way of praying, and offering for the Dead, *oblationes, pro defunctis, pro Natalitiis annua die facimus*. Mr. *Pool* on the Words *HOC FACITE*, *Luke* xxii. 19. acknowledges that the *Hebrew* Verb נָשַׁךְ signifies to offer, but by a gross Mistake denies that the *LXX* ever render'd it by ΠΟΙΕΙΝ, or that *FACERE* with an Accusative Case is so used in the *Latin*. Which I have shew'd is not true of the *Vulgar Latin Bible*, nor by consequence of the Writers of the *Latin Church*, who cite that Translation, or otherwise *Hellenize* in their Writings. He might have remembred *Missam facere*, which is a Phrase of the *Latin Church* for offering the Eucharist at least as old, as the latter end of the *IVth Century*.

In this sacrificial Signification of ΠΟΙΕΙΝ <sup>r</sup> προσκομιδὴν ποιῆν in *St. Gregory's Liturgy* signifies to offer the Oblations. And in *St. Chrysostom's Office* of the Holy Sacrament, where the Deacon saith to the Priest

---

<sup>r</sup> Καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς κερῶροι τ' εὐχάριστος, καὶ ὁρῶν αὐτῶ τ' χεῖρ λαμβάνουσιν τ' θυσίαν ταύτην, &c. τί δὲ ποιεῖ; ὅτι θέλει αὐτὸ, καὶ προαγῶν τὸ προσῆμα ἀπέφηνεν, ἐκέτι θυσίαν.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. IV. cap. xxxiv.

<sup>r</sup> De Corona, cap. ii.

<sup>r</sup> Bibl. Patrum Edit. Parisiis MDCXXIV. Tom. ii. p. 127.

<sup>r</sup> καὶ ἐπ'



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 67

καρπὸς τῆς θωήσεως τοῦ κυρίου, *it is time to offer, or sacrifice to the Lord.* Upon which the learned Editor hath this Note: *Diaconus tribus digitis stolam tenens, & altare indicans Divinum, & tremendum sacrificii ministerium, ut sacerdos aggrediatur admonet: & Domini verbis—præterea FACIENDI verbum ad sacrificia pertinet.* Hinc Varro Lib. V. de Lingua Latina Agnam Jovi facere, & similiter Virgilius, facere vitulum pro frugibus: rursusque idem Varro, Pontificis nomen trahit ex eo deductum, quod potens sit facere, id est sacrificare, nec ignota est Hebræis, addit Pineda in Job, hæc loquendi ratio: ubi enim in Psalm LXVI. legimus, offeram tibi boves cum hircis. Hebræa Litera habet faciam tibi boves cum hircis. Et pariter Exod. xxix. ubi habemus, vitulum pro peccato offeres, legit iterum Hebræa facies: & eodem FACIENDI verbo utitur Christus in hujus sacrificii institutione dicens. Hoc facite in mei memoriam; & de Altaris sacro ministerio loquens Ambrosius, missam, inquit Epist. xxxiii. facere cæpi. Καρπὸς ergο τῆς θωήσεως τοῦ κυρίου — & pari ratione admonet Diaconus Latinus Sacerdotem: Immola Deo sacrificium laudis.

According to this sacrificial signification of the Verb θωεῖν *facere*, and in particular from the signification of it, *to offer*, in the Paschal Sacrifice, we may justly observe, that the Words τῶτο θωεῖτε, *hoc facite* either relate to the whole Action and Ministration of the Holy Eucharist, as אֵין in the Hebrew, and τῶτο in the Greek relate to the whole Service of the Passover, Exod. xii. 27. and then it proves the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, (in which the Oblation of the Bread and Cup to God

---

\* In the Liturgy extant in the IVth Vol. of his Works it is Θύγον.

\* This is an Error: for it is, Flamen Dialis Agna Jovi facit. And so in Virg. *facere vitula*, and the places are so cited by Brisson de formulis, p. 22. But the Latins say, *facere rem Divinam, & sacra facere.*

## 68 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Father was a principal part) to be ἱεροποιία, or ἱερωσύνη, a sacrificial Service: Or else they relate more especially to the Bread and Wine; and then by a natural and easy Interpretation they may be translated thus: *Take, eat, this is my Body, offer this in remembrance of me: and This is my Blood—offer this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.* Either of these Senses of τὸ τοιοῦτον, hoc facite give us a good account of the reason, why the ancient Fathers treating of this Mystery, affirm it to be the Oblation of the Church, which Christ appointed to be offer'd, as I have already shew'd, particularly out of Irenæus, Lib. iv. cap. 34. whither I refer the Reader.

VIII. The next Places of the New Testament from which I shall prove that the Christian Religion hath a Sacrifice are those, which imply, or express that it hath an Altar. For if it hath a Sacrifice, or Oblation, as I have shew'd, then it must have an Altar, at which to offer that Oblation; and if it have an Altar, as I am going to shew, then it must have an Oblation to be offered at, or upon it, and then by consequence the Ministers of the Gospel must be Altar-Ministers, as well as offering Priests. I will begin with that Text, 1 Cor. ix. *Do ye not know, that they, who minister about holy things live of the things of the Temple, and they, who wait at the Altar are Partakers with the Altar?* The Words in the Original for Ministers about holy Things are ἱεραὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου, those, who exercise the Priestly Offices, saith the Arabick, or the Offerers of Sacrifices, as the Ethiopick Version hath it, and for those, who wait at the Altar, οἱ τὰς θυσίας προσέχοντες, literally *qui assident Altari*, those whose Office is to attend at the Altar. In the Latin Version *Nescitis, quoniam, qui in sacrario operantur, que de sacrario sunt edunt, & qui ALTARI DESERVUNT cum Altari participant.* Know you not that they, who minister in the Temple, eat of the things of the Temple, and

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 69

and they who serve at the Altar, partake with the Altar. This Text is applied by <sup>v</sup> Irenæus to the Christian Ministers in these Words: *Sacerdotes autem sunt omnes Domini Apostoli, qui neque agros neque domos hereditant hic, sed semper Altari, & Deo serviunt*, where I doubt not the original Words were οἱ τῶν Δουλοῦντες, & Δεῶν ὑποτάσσονται, and the learned Dr. GRABE puts this Note of Eusebius upon the place: *it is easie to see from hence, that from the times of Christ, his Apostles, and Martyrs, and thereafter, the Christians had Altars in their Temples, at which they offered the unbloody Sacrifice of the Body, and Blood of Christ in perpetual Memory of his Death. Which Irenæus also confirms in the xxxiv<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the same Book, by these Words of Christ: When thou bringest thy Gift unto the Altar.* This Place is also applied by St. Cyprian \* in I. Epist. to the Priests and Deacons, and People of Furni a City of Africa so called, in this Passage: *Jampridem in concilio Episcoporum statutum sit, ne quis de clericis, & Dei ministris tutorem vel curatorem testamento suo constituat, quando singuli Divino Sacerdotio honorati, & in clerico ministerio constituti, non nisi ALTARI, & SACRIFICUS deservire, & precibus, atque orationibus vacare debent*, it was long since decreed in a Council of Bishops that no Man should appoint a Clergyman, and Minister of God for Tutor, or Curator of his last Will; and Testament, because all that are dignified with the divine Priesthood [that is all Priests] and Deacons constituted in the clerical Ministration, ought not to wait but at the Altar, and Oblations, and devote themselves to Prayer. Here this Holy Father plainly alludes to *Altari deserviant* in the Text, as he also alludes to τὰ ἁγία ἑστῶσιν, They who minister about holy Things in the other Expressions, which follow, *qui divinis rebus, & spiritualibus occu-*

<sup>v</sup> Lib. IV. cap. xx.

\* Edit. Oxon.

## 70 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

*patis; qui operationibus divinis insistant; ab Altari & Sacrificiis non recedant.* All which shew that he thought Evangelical Priests to be as proper Ministers about Holy Things, and Waiters at God's Altar in a proper sense, as the Levitical Clergy under the Law.

I should from hence return to *Matth. v. 23.* *when thou bringest thy Gift to the Altar, &c.* But having said enough upon that place, I proceed to *Heb. xiii. 10.* where the Apostle saith expressly *we have an Altar, whereof they have no Right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle.* In the Original whereof is ΕΞ ΟΥ, which may be render'd in a literal, and proper sense EX QUO or DE QUO<sup>2</sup>. Of which, or from which they have no right to eat, as the excellent Author of the *Propitiatory Oblation* in the Holy Eucharist hath rightly observed. But because the generality of learned Men have taken ALTAR here in the metonymical Sense for the *Altar-Offering*, as the *Latin Translation*, and ours take *Temple*, *1 Cor. ix. 13.* for the holy Provision of the Temple, I am therefore content to take it in the same Sense, which will not in the least abate the force of my Argument from the place, because if Altar there be put for the Sacrifice, or Oblation of the Altar, that metonymical use of the Word proves the first and proper Sense of it, as much, as the use of τραπέζα in Greek, and Mensa in the Latin Tongue for the Meat or Entertainment

---

<sup>2</sup> Tena in locum. Quare ineptè Lutherani, & Beza—Fin-gunt Paulum hic agere de sacrificio orationum, laudum, vel gratia-rum actionum: quia præterquam quod ad hæc non necessario altare erigitur, cum possint sine illo fieri, hic Paulus agit de sacrificio man-ducabili, quod supra altaris mensa Christianis ponitur—sacrifi-cium vero orationum, & laudum non est manducabile.—Cum ergo hic de altari, & mensa realis, & propria manducationis sit sermo, ut Judaicis escis nostra esca contraponeretur, consequens est de Altari Eucharistia loqui, quæ est vera esca realiter, & sacramentaliter man-ducabilis. His whole Exposition of the place is most excellent, and worthy to be read, excepting that he misapplies the Euchar-istical Sacrifice to the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 71

upon the Table, proves it to be a Table in the primary, proper, literal Sense.

But perhaps, Sir, your late Writer will say, the Apostle doth not mean a proper material Altar, upon which Offerings were made, and then eaten, but an improper metaphorical Altar, by way of Allusion, and Similitude; and so, Sir, if he pleases he may say the Apostle meant only an improper metaphorical High-Priest, where he says in the same Epistle, *We have a great High-Priest, that is passed into the Heavens, we have not an High-Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, we have such an High-Priest, who is set on the right Hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the Heavens.* The Phrase is the <sup>a</sup> same, Ἐχομεν θυσιαστήριον, and τοῖστων ἔχομεν ἀρχιερεῖα, and εἰ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερεῖα μὴ θυνάμηνον ὑπαθῆσαι, &c. *Habemus Altare, talem habemus Pontificem, non enim habemus Pontificem, qui non possit compati infirmitatibus nostris.* And since the High-Priest we have, is a more proper High-Priest than the Jewish High-Priest, who was but his Shadow, it would be very arbitrary in him to assert that the Altar we are said to have is not a proper Altar, especially considering that the <sup>b</sup> Jerusalem-Altar,

---

<sup>a</sup> Heb. xiii. 10. *Habemus Altare ex quo edendi non habent potestatem, qui Tabernaculo deserviunt. Extra Judaeorum itaque Templum in Ecclesia erat θυσιαστήριον, Altare, & per consequens etiam θυσία, Sacrificium, non solum rationale laudis & precum, sed & materiale Panis, & Vini, quod verbū edendi clarè significat Apostolus.* Dr. Ernest. Græbe on Iren. Lib. iv. cap. xxxiv.

<sup>b</sup> There is no more difference between a Table and an Altar, than between another Cup and a Chalice, or an House and a Church, or a Feast and a Sacrifice. *Mede of the Name Altar, Sect. 11.* So among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews, consecrated, or dedicated Tables were used for Altars, as Macrobius shews upon this Verse of Virgil, in answer to this Objection of Evang. *Cum non in mensam, sed in aram secundum morem libare debuerint.*

In MENSAM læti libant divosque precantur.

Ego autem, quod mihi magistra Lætiōne compertum est, publicabo.

## 72 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

tar, for the Reason hereafter given, is several times call'd The Table of the Lord; in *Malach. i. 7, 12.* and *Ezechiel xli. 22. xlv. 16.* as the Offerings upon it are called his Food, which he consumed by Fire. And that the Altar we are said to have is such an Altar, of which, <sup>d</sup> that is, of the

In Papyriano enim jure, evidenter relatum est aræ vicem prestare posse mensam dicatam. Ut in Templo, inquit, Junonis Populonia augusta mensa est. Namque in sancta alia vasorum sunt, & sacra suppellectilium, alia ornamentorum. Quæ vasorum sunt, instrumenti instar habent, quibus Sacrificia consciuntur. Quarum rerum principem locum obtinet mensa, in qua epule, libationes, & sipes reponuntur. Ornamenta vero sunt clypei, corone, & ejusmodi donaria. Neque enim donaria dedicantur ea tempore, quo delubra sacrantur. At vero mensa, aruleque eodem die, quo ades ipsa, dedicari solent. Unde mensa hoc ritu dedicata in Templo aræ usum, & religionem obtinet pulvinaris. Ergo apud Evandrum quidem sit iusta libatio; quippe apud eam mensam, qua cum aræ MAXIMA, more utique religionis, fuerat dedicata, & in loco sacro, & inter ipsa sacra, in quibus epulabantur. Lib. iii. cap. 12.

To this let me add what Servius saith on this Verse, *Quæritur sane cur in MENSAM, & non in ARAM, libaverint. Sed apud antiquos inter vasorum suppellectilem, etiam Mensam cum, Aris, mos erat consecrari, quo die Templum consecrabatur. Unde bene ait in Mensam læti libant, quam constabat cum Ara MAXIMA dedicatam. So De la Cerda. In mensam læti libant] viz. Effusa aliqua parte vini & patera in mensam. Ex eodem more in. v. En. dixit, in Mensam læticum libavit honorem. Et Sil. Ital. lib. 2.*

—Ante omnes Ductor honori  
Nominis Augusto libat carchesia ritu.  
Cætera, quem sequitur, Bacchique ex more liquorem  
Irrorat mensis turba.

Sed quæ ratio hujus moris? Quia veteribus Mensa pro Ara fuit—  
*Vid. Scal. in Festum, & Lips. Lib. in Antiqu. LeB. oppugnat posterior, imo videt Macrobius interpretantem Virgilium, Lib. 3. Sat. cap. 11. secus ac par est.*

\* *Lev. iii. 11, 16.* In the original *עֹלֶת אֵשׁ* and *עֹלֶת אֵשׁ*.  
Vulg. In pabulum ignis, & oblationis Domini. In Alimoniam Ignis, & suavissimi odoris. V. Munster. Fag. & Clar. in locum. Castal. Jove Dapem rei divina.

<sup>d</sup> *Tern.* Nomine enim altaris per figuram metonymiam intelligitur Sacrificium super altare positum.

Sacrifice

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 73

Sacrifices of which, neither the Priests, who were Ministers of the Tabernacle, nor their People had any right to eat, but the Christian Ministers and People have: The Apostle proves by an Argument taken from their own Law. For if they could not eat of the <sup>e</sup> Sacrifices of Atonement, and Expiation, which prefigured the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, how could they partake at the Christian Altar of the Christian Sacrifice, which was the mystical Flesh and Blood of Christ, by which the Sacrifice of himself upon the Cross was represented according to his own Institution under the new Law, as it was under the old by the Sacrifices of Expiation, whose Bodies were burnt without the Camp? *We have an Altar*, saith he, *that is an Altar-Sacrifice, whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle. For the Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the High-Priest for Sin, are burnt without the Camp; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood; suffered without the City Gate; and his suffering there signifies the Exclusion of all legal Eaters, from partaking of him, who, as a Sin-offering, was carried without the Camp.* Here is Altar answering to Altar, and Sacrifice to Sacrifice; the Sacrifice, which was a Figure of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross before his Suffering, to that which is the Figure of it after. And therefore the Syrian Churches read this place as proper in the Ordination of their Priests. And what St. Chrysostom saith upon the place can relate to nothing, but the Eucharistical Oblation of the Elements, and the participation of them, as will appear from this Version of them, *Οὐχ' οἶα τὰ Ἰουδαῖα*, &c. *The rites, or religious Observances among us (saith he) are not such as the Jewish were, insomuch, that it is not lawful for the High-Priest to partake of them. Wherefore, be-*

---

<sup>e</sup> Lev. vi. 30. iv. 7, 12. xvi. 27.

## 74 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

cause he had said DO <sup>†</sup> not observe, like one who overthrows his own Sayings, he turns about in this manner: What, and do not we observe [Meats] saith he? Yes we observe them more exactly, not communicating of them to the Priests themselves. If this Commentary on the Text, We have an Altar, &c. relates not to the Communion-Table, and literal, and oral eating of the Eucharistical Bread at it, I must confess I do not rightly understand it: the original Words *Μετ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* and *Μετὰ τοῦ βύβλιος αὐτῶν* are *Communion-phrases*. But upon supposition that they relate not at all to the oral-eating at the Communion-board, it is no argument against that Sense of the Text, because this Father speaks of it in the common Sense of the Church as of the Christian Altar, and of the Oblation, and Participation of the Bread, and Wine, as of a Sacrifice in numerous places of his Works; as I have shew'd in this Book, and might shew it from many more; as that in *Hom. 8. de Pœnit. & Hom. 28. in 2 Cor.* *Μετὰ κατὰ τοὺς (ὑμῶν) ὁρῶντες τὸ ἱερὸς αὐτῶν τροφίμους καὶ τὸ ἄγλας μετ' ἡμῶν δύστας.* Theodoret, Theophylact, and Oecumenius, all understand it in a literal Sense of a proper Altar, and the Summary of all their Commentaries upon the place amounts to thus much; that After the Apostle had told the Hebrews, that they had been fed with Meats of carnal Sacrifices, and Offerings, which had not profited them, then lest they should think the Christian Worship contemptible, for want of such Observances, he tells them, that the Christians have an Altar, and a Sacrifice, but of another kind, of which their Priests were not worthy to partake because they served the Tabernacle, and not the Truth, of which that was the Type, and Shadow. Particularly saith Theodoret, We have an Altar much more excellent than that old one under the Law, for that was but the Shadow of this. That was an Altar for Sacrifices

---

† Μὴ ὁρῶντες.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 75

void of Reason, but this is an Altar for a spiritual, and divine Sacrifice, of which none of the Jewish Priests could partake, unless they were first converted to Faith in our Lord. For the farther Explication of which, it is to be observed, that as the great Altar at the Temple of Hierusalem was so called with Respect to the Sacrifices, which were offered there, but with Respect to the Consumption of them upon it by Fire, was called also the <sup>s</sup> Lord's Table: So the *Lord's Table* in Christian Churches was considered in a double Respect, first with Relation to the Offering of the Bread and Wine upon it, and secondly with Relation to the Consumption, or Participation of them in the sacrificial Feast at it, and as in the latter Respect, the Apostle called it, the *Lord's Table*, so in the former it is an *Altar*, and therefore the Apostle by a usual metonymy of the *Altar* for the Sacrifice of the Altar, said, *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat, who serve at the Tabernacle.* So in different respects it was called by both Names in Ecclesiastical Writers. As in <sup>b</sup> Synesius. *I will cleave to the Holy Pillars, which support thy sacred Table, the unbloody Altar.* So <sup>c</sup> Gregor. Nyssen. Οὐρανίου σου τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου, &c. This holy Altar at which we stand, is by nature a common Stone; but after it is consecrated to the Worship of God, and receives the Blessing, it becomes an Holy Table, an unpollutable Altar, not to be touched by every one, but only by the Priests, and such Priests as fear God. So Socrates, lib. 1. cap. 37. telling how Alexander Bishop of C. P. retired into

---

<sup>a</sup> Ezek. xli. 22. The Altar of Wood was three Cubits high —and he said unto me, this is the Table that is before the Lord. xlv. 16. They shall enter into my Sanctuary, and they shall come near to my Table to minister unto me, and they shall keep my Charge. Malachi i. 7. Ye say the Table of the Lord is contemptible. V. 12. The Table of the Lord is polluted, and the Fruits thereof, even his Meat, is contemptible.

<sup>b</sup> In Catastasi. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς ἑκκλησίας, &c.

<sup>c</sup> Orat. de Baptismo,

## 76 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

the Church of St. Irene to pray, faith, that having made himself to be locked up alone in the Church of Irene, he went to the Altar and prostrating himself under the Holy Table, he continued many Nights and Days together, praying unto God with Tears. So in the disp. *contra Arium* in Concil. Nic. ascribed to Athanasius, p. 122. edit. Par. 1627. *Ἡγιασμένους τοῖς μέγεθος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἁγίῳ ἑστῶτες, καὶ ἀφάρατον, ἔχοντες ὑπὸ τὴν ἁγίαν Τράπεζαν, ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἁγία Ἀρά, καὶ τὸ οὐράνιον, καὶ ἀφθάρτου ἄρτον ἐπ' αὐτῇ.* An Altar therefore it is according to the Ancients, as well as a Table; an Altar with respect to the Oblations, and a Table with respect to the eating, or participation of them, as among the Heathens, who according to the Verse of Virgil, and Macrobius's comment on it in the Margin before, not only eat their Altar-offerings at their holy Tables, but often offered upon them; especially their Meat and Drink-offerings, upon which they feasted with their Priests in honour of their Gods.

Indeed they used them so often as Altars to offer on, as well as Tables to eat at, that learned Men are of Opinion, they looked upon them, as Altars, as is to be seen in the <sup>1</sup> Margin. I have observed this to shew that the same thing in different respects may be both a Table, and an Altar. For as a Table is that at which we eat; so an Altar is that at, or upon which we offer, and therefore an Altar in the old Teutonick Language is called *Hunsel-stath* the Place of Offering. So the Rocks in the Medi-

<sup>1</sup> Martini Lexicon in LIBO. Turneb. lib. 2. 7. *Illud Plauti, de poculo paululum hoc tibi dabo lubenter, explicans ait. De poculo plena, quod erat potatura, paululum veneri libat, i. e. in honorem venenis effundit, sic enim libare solebant, quod vel in Aram faciebant, vel in mensam, que loco Aræ erat—* & lib. 23. c. 40. *Quid est in mensam libare, nempe Religionis causa, de patera, prorsusquam libas in mensam, que Opinio veterum sacra erat, & tanquam quædam Ara, aliquid de vino effundere, &c.*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 77

terranean Sea between Sardinia, and Africa, upon which the Romans, and Carthaginians sacrificed, when they solemnized their mutual League, were ever after called *Altars* by the *Latins*, as *Virgil* tells us in these Verses:

*Tres Notus abreptas in Saxa latentia torquet  
Saxa vocant Itali mediis qua in fluctibus, ARAS,  
Dorsum immane mari summo —*

And so the Rock, upon which *Manash* offered unto the Lord, *Judges* xiii. 19. is called the *Altar* in v. 20. *ἡ θυσιαστήριον* in the Greek Version, which I have observed to shew with what Propriety of Speech the Holy Communion Table hath been called the *Altar* from the Apostles time to the Reformation. It is so called four times in the Epistles of the holy Martyr *St. Ignatius*, who was *St. John's* Disciple, first in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, where he saith, *Μὴ τις ἀνασπάσει, ἐκὼν ἢ ἄντι, τὸ δοκίμιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός.* Lat. *no Man deceive himself, unless a Man be within the Altar, he is deprived of the Bread of God.* From whence it is plain, that by the *Altar* he meant the Lord's Table, upon which the Bread was offered. So in his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, Being come together into the same Place, have one Common Prayer, one Supplication, one Hope in Charity, and in pure Joy. [For] there is one [that is, but one] Lord *Iesus Christ*, than whom nothing is more excellent. Wherefore come ye all together (ὡς εἰς ναὸν) as unto one Temple of

<sup>a</sup> *Æscid. Lib. I. V. 112.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ἐκείνη ἡ θυσιαστήριον.*

<sup>c</sup> These Words of *Ignatius* (saith *Mr. Mede*) directly imply, that the Altar was the Place, as of the Bread of God, so of the publick Prayers of the Church. — So that he who was not within the Altar, or divided therefrom had no Benefit of either. *Christian Sacrif. Book II. Cap. v.*

## 78 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

God, as to one Altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded from the Father. Here as Naab's Temple is taken literally: So Ουκιασχορον Altar is to be understood. So in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, Wherefore let it be your Study to partake all of the same Eucharist. For there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup for the Unity of his Blood; one Altar, as also there is one Bishop [i. e. but one Bishop] with his Presbyters and Deacons, my Fellow Servants, That whatsoever you do, you may do it according to the Will of God. From this Place we may learn first what is the Sacrifice of this one Altar, viz. The Holy Eucharist; and who are the Priests that offer up this Sacrifice? the Bishops, and Presbyters, as sacerdotal Ministers, and the Deacons as subservient inferior Ministers, according to their Office before described. So in his Epistle to the Trallesians, Continue inseparable from Jesus Christ our God, and from your Bishop, and from the Commands of the Apostles. For he that is within the Altar is pure; but he that is without, that is, who doth any thing without the Bishop, and Presbyters, and Deacons, is not pure in his Conscience. Indeed this Phrase of being within, and without the Altar, is a Figure, or Metonymy by which Altar is put for the Communion of the Altar. But then, as the Eucharistical Cup, when it is souped for the Wine in the Cup, supposes the Cup to be a real material Cup: So the Christian Altar, when it is put for the Communion of the Altar, where the Priests, and the faithful People partake together of the holy Feast, it signifies a real material Altar, at which they ministered, and these receiv'd. I need not say more to shew how the ancient Christians took the Lord's Table to be a proper material Altar, and that it is implied to be such in those Words of our Lord, If thou bringest thy Gift unto the Altar, and there rememberest, that thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave thy Gift before



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 79

fore the Altar, and go, first be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come, and offer thy Gift. The ancient Christians (saith Mr. Mede) took this to be an Evangelical Constitution; wherein our <sup>P</sup> Saviour implied by way of Anticipation, that he would leave some Rite to his Church <sup>9</sup> instead of, and after the manner of the Sacrifices of the Law, which should begin with an Oblation as they did; and that to require this proper and peculiar Qualification in the Offerer, to be at Peace, and without Enmity, with his Brother — Hence also they may seem to have learned to call Bread and Wine (in respect of this Oblation) *ἁγία δῶρα*, the holy Gifts, from the Word our Saviour here useth, &c. Mr. Mede of the Name Altar, Sect. 11.

I hope I have now made it appear in this Paragraph that the Communion-Table in respect of its different uses is an Altar as well, as a Table: An Altar upon which the Elements are presented, and offered up by the Minister to God the Father, and a Table at which after they are consecrated into the Symbols of Christ's dead Body, and Blood, they are consumed by the Offerers in the holy sacrificial Banquet. This I have done to obviate a common modern Objection that the holy Table cannot be an Altar, because it is a Table; an Objection, which will as well prove that the same Man cannot be a Preceptor, as well as a Father to his Child; or that the same Machine, as among the Nomades, Scythians, old Germans, and other Hamaxobians, cannot be both a Waggon for Carriage, and a Dwelling-house; or lastly to give a

---

<sup>P</sup> Cyprian. Epist. 63. *Christus hujus Sacrificii Auctor, & Doctor. Irenæus Lib. IV. Cap. 34. Igitur Ecclesia oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum Sacrificium, & acceptum est eis.*

<sup>9</sup> Non genus Oblationum reprobatur; Oblationes enim & illie, Oblationes autem & hic. Sacrificia in populo, Sacrificia & in Ecclesia, sed Species immutata est tantum. Ibid.

scriptural,

## 80 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

scriptural, and more reverential Instance, that our Saviour could not be both *Sacrifice*, and *Priest*: And that the *Communion-Table* was not a mere Table, but an Altar too, is also plain from the distinction in the Greek Church between the *ΠΡΟΘΕΣΙΣ* and the *ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ*, the former of which they accounted only as a Table, to which the Offerings were brought, but the latter they esteemed as an Altar, because the Bread, and Wine were there presented to God the Father, and then consecrated into the Body, and Blood of Christ.

IX. Having shew'd from one Place of the New Testament, that the Ministers of Christ are proper Altar-Ministers, because they minister at a proper Altar; I now proceed to shew from another place, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. that they offer Sacrifice, and by consequence that they are proper offering, or sacrificing Priests. *These are the Words, But the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and I would not that ye should have Fellowship with Devils. Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils.* For the Devils had their Tables for their sacrificial Feasts, as well as the true God, as is plain from the Testimony of St. Chrysostom in his Homily on St. Lucian the Martyr, whom they tempted by famishing of him to eat of the things offered to the Idol-Gods. But, saith he, in that Extremity of Hunger the Fear of God withheld the Martyr's Hands, and made him forget Nature: for while he beheld that polluted, and execrable Table,

---

\* Goar in his Notes in Ord. sacri Ministerii, p. 16. ΠΡΟΘΕΣΙΣ, quam perperam Genebrardus Altare interpretatur cum rectius, propositio, seu propositionis Mensa dici queat. Que non sacrificio, sed pani tantum offerendo dicata sit — Itaque solummodo est ΠΡΟΘΕΣΙΣ, non ΘΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. In Chrysost. Miss. 116. Illud certum est, Πρὸς Θεὸν esse mensam, in qua sacra dona προσφέρῃ primo immolanda proponuntur.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 81

he remembered the other tremendous Table, which was full of the Spirit, and was so inflamed, that he chose to endure, and suffer all things, rather than taste of those unhallowed Meats. So in his XXIVth Homily on 1 Cor. x. the same Father expressly takes notice of the Tables, at which the Heathens eat of their Idol-Sacrifices: *How then ye Corinthians, can ye do such contrary things, as to bless God, who hath delivered you from Idols, and yet run again unto their Tables. And again, art thou not then ashamed, when these damned, and slavish People prepare a Table to run and partake of what is set thereon. So Isaiah lxx. 11, 12. the idolatrous part of the Jews are charged with preparing two Tables, one to GAD, and the other to MENI: But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy Mountain, that prepare a Table for Gad, and that furnish a Drink-offering unto Meni. It is, in the LXXII. ετοιμαζομεν τὸ δαπνῶν τετραπύλῳ, that prepare a Table to the Devil, and is so cited by Just. Mart. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 365. It is plain from Scripture, that the Sacrifices were eaten at the Place where they were offered. Thus Numb. xxv. 2. The Amorites called the Israelites unto the Sacrifices of their Gods, and the People did eat, and bowed down to their Gods. So Exod. xviii. 12. Jethro Moses's father in law took a burnt offering, and sacrifices for God, and Aaron, and all the elders of Israel came to eat bread with Moses's father in law before God. So 1 Sam. xvi. Jesse, and his Sons were called by Samuel to the Sacrifice, V. 5. and in the 11th Verse, when Jesse told him his youngest Son was not there, he said, send, and fetch him, for we will not sit down till he come hither. Now at what*

---

<sup>f</sup> See Exod. xxxii. 5, 6. 1 Sam. ix. 12, 13. Gen. xxxi. 54.

<sup>g</sup> Munster in Locum. Discumbemus] hoc dicitur, quod post Sacrificia pacificorum edebantur consecrata. Habet proprie Hebraismus circumdabimus, quoniam sedebant in Corona ad Mensam.

## 82 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

were they to sit down, or according to the Original about what were they to sit? I suppose *at*, or *about* a *Table*. It is also plain from the Story of *Cleobis*, and *Biton* in "*Herodotus*, that Sacrifices among the Heathens were eaten before the *Idol*, or at the Place, where they were offered to him; for it was in the Temple of *Juno* where her Image was, that the Mother of those two Brethren, and the rest of the *Argives* sacrificed, and feasted. Which occasioned *Drusus* to write on these " Words: And they lay themselves down by every Altar, as followeth. *Veteres intra ipsum Templum solebant solennia sacrificiorum convivia agitare, ut apparet ex historia, quam refert Herodotus de Cleobe, & Bitone, & ex Aristophane in Pluto.* 1-Cor. viii. 10. εἰδωλείον quibusdam est Idolorum templum aliis ipsa Mensa, in qua Epule celebrabantur. So *Liveli* upon the Place, *Inclinant se*] Alludit ad veterem discumbendi morem, quo Epulantes ad Mensam non ut nos hodie sederunt, sed accubuerunt, reclinata supra parte corporis in cubitum sinistrum, &c. Juxta omnia Altaria in Domino Deorum [suorum] Idololatræ in Idoleis suis coram Idolis conviventes accumbebant. 1 Cor. viii. 10. Si quis te viderit in Idoleo accumbere, conscientia infirmi instruetur ad comedendum, ea, quæ sunt Idolis mactata. Ibid. x. 21. Non potestis poculum Domini bibere, & poculum Demoniorum. Horat. Od. xxxvii. lib. 1.

*Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero  
Pulsanda tellus: Nunc Saliaribus  
Ornare pulvinar Deorum  
Tempus erat Dapibus, sodales.*

So certain it is \* as a late Writer may observe, that the Heathens had *Tables*, at which they eat of the Sacrifices of their Gods, that the learned

\* Clio. xxxi.

† Malachi. ii. 8.

‡ Dr. Hancock.

§ Tran-



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 83

Translator of *Homer's Iliads* into Latin Verse renders

———— Τετύχοντό τε δαῖτα  
δαίμνι' —————

In the Sacrifices, which the *Gracians* offered at the Altars of <sup>2</sup> *Apollo*, and <sup>3</sup> *Jupiter*.

—— *Mensas dapibus præstantibus augent,*  
—— *Lautisque agitant convivium mensis.*

And to their Custom of eating their sacrificial Feast in their Temples, or in Places so called from their Sacrifices, is plain from such Passages in the Prince of Poets, as these which follow :

——<sup>b</sup> *Hoc illis curia Templum*  
*Ha sacris sedes epulis : hic Ariete caso*  
*Perpetuis soliti patres considerare mensis.*

<sup>c</sup> *Nunc pateras libare Jovi, precibusque vocare*  
*Anchisen Genitorem, & vina reponite mensis.*

<sup>d</sup> ——— *Ocyus omnes*  
*In mensam lati libant, Divosque precantur.*

These Tables, on which they eat their sacrificial Banquets, were in the same place, where they offered them, at or near the Images or Altars of their Gods, as appears from the Sacrifice, just now mentioned which the *Gracians* offered to *Apollo*.

————— Ἐκδιδόμενῃν βῆσ' ἐνεβόλω Ἀπόλλωνι  
Τὴν μὲ ἱερίῃ ὀπί βωμόν αἰών.

<sup>1</sup> *Helius Eobanus Hessus.*

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad. lib. 11.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid. v. 133.*

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad. lib. 1.*

<sup>5</sup> *Æn. 7. v. 173.*

<sup>6</sup> *Æn. 8. v. 278.*

## 84 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

To which let me add these Verses in *Virgil* speaking of *Iarbas* :

<sup>c</sup> *Dicitur ante Aras media inter numina Divum  
Multa Jovem manibus supplex orasse supinis.*

<sup>d</sup> *Jupiter omnipotens, cui nunc Maurusia piæis*

<sup>e</sup> *Gens epulata toris* <sup>f</sup> *lenæum libat honorem.*

<sup>g</sup> *Jamque dies epulata novem gens omnis, & Aris  
Factus honos —*

<sup>h</sup> *Briffonius* shews, that as they were wont in their Prayers to touch, or embrace the Altars, and Images of their Gods : so they used in their Addresses to them to touch the Tables : *similiterque in Mensa, in qua bene precari moris fuit Livius* ait, *precantes Mensam tangebant, Ovid. Lib. I. Amor. Eleg. iii.*

*Tange precor Mensam, tangunt quo more precantes.*

Lastly, that the *Greeks* had Tables in their Temples appears from what <sup>i</sup> *Tully* saith of the *Sicilian* Tyrant, and great Desider of the Gods, *Dionysius* : *jam mensas argenteas de omnibus delubris jussit auferri, in quibus quod more veteris Græcia inscriptum esset BONORUM DEORUM, uti se eorum bonitati velle dicebat.*

I have observed all this of *Tables* in the *Temples*, or *Places* of *Idol-worship*, to shew how exact the *Analogy*, or *Parallel* of the *Apostle* is between eating at the *Lord's Table*, and the *Table of Devils*; and I need not observe, that to drink the *Cup* of

<sup>c</sup> *Æn. 4. V. 204.*

<sup>d</sup> *Lenæum libare bonorem, est vini primitias in mensam five aram Jovis infundere.* *Æn. 5. V. 762.*

<sup>e</sup> *De Form. Lib. i. p. 45.*

<sup>f</sup> *De Nat. Deorum, Lib. iii. versus finem Libri*

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 85

the Lord, and the Cup of *Demons*, or Devils, and to be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils, are metonymical Expressions, which properly signify to drink of the Wine offered to the Lord, and of the Wine offered to Devils, and to be Partakers of the Sacrifices of the Lord's Table, or Altar, and of the Sacrifices of the Tables, or of the Altars of Devils. Such is the Phrase in the preceding Chapter, *They who wait at the Altar are Partakers with the Altar, i. e.* They who wait at the Altar, are Partakers of the Sacrifices with the Altar. According to this Observation, the Words of the Apostle, may be paraphrased thus: *But in Answer to the Objection, that an Idol is nothing, you ought to understand, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice to Idols, they indeed sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and they, who eat of the things sacrificed to them, have Communion with those Devils, and I would not, my Brethren, that you should have Fellowship with Devils. For by the common Notion of Communion, in which the Worshipers of Demons in Images, and the Worshipers of God agree, ye cannot with consistency drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, ye cannot be Partakers, or Communicants at the Lord's Table, and at the Tables of Devils, i. e. Ye cannot hold Communion, ye cannot be in Covenant, with them both.* The Argument, which the Apostle here uses against the Christians eating of the Sacrifices at the Tables, or of the Altars of Devils, is founded on this common Principle, received by the Jewish, and Gentile World, that the eating, or partaking at the Table or from the Altar of any reputed God of the things sacrificed to him, was in its Nature, and common Construction an Act of Communion with that God, and therefore by this common Notion of religious Fellowship, or Communion, Christians could not consistently with their Religion eat at the Lord's Table,

## 86 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and at the Table of Devils, or communicate with Devils, and with him, who came to destroy the Works of the Devil, and all the religious Worship of Devils in the Gentile World. This Observation helps to set the Parallel which the Apostle draws betwixt Altar-Communion with God, and Devils in a clear Light. For First, Oblations, or Sacrifices were offered to both : to the former only upon the Holy Table-Altar, but to the latter both upon their Altars, and <sup>k</sup> their Tables. Secondly, it is plain those Oblations to both were eaten by the Offerers at Tables, and Thirdly, that the Cup was offered at the Lord's Table, as well as at the Table of Devils, and by consequence in the Fourth place, that they were  $\text{ἱερείς}$ , or sacrificing Ministers, as <sup>l</sup> Pollux calls Priests, who offered upon the Lord's Table, as idolatrous Priests did upon the Altars or Tables of the Devils, and thence and there feasted their People in the Name of their false Gods. I say, the whole Parallel between Eating and Drinking at the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils, supposes, that they eat and drank of things which had been offered, and by consequence, that the Ministers of the Lord's Table, upon which the Bread, and Wine were first solemnly offered, and then consumed, in the sacrificial Banquet, are sacrificing Priests : Such as in the ix<sup>th</sup> Chapter and 13<sup>th</sup> Verse of this Epistle, the Apostle speaking of Jewish Priests, calls  $\text{τὰ ἱερὰ ἑσθίουσιν, καὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Sacra operantes, or Sacra procurantes, Altari deservientes, or Altari operam dantes, Ministers about holy Things pertaining to God, Wai-}$

---

<sup>k</sup> Brissonius de form. Lib. I. p. 90. *Illud compertum habeo in MENSA, & inter scyphos, & pocula, ubi Libare Diis dapes, & bene precari moris fuisse* Livius, Lib. xix. *Scriliit, jactari consuevisse vocem hanc BENE.* — *Hoc ita perspicue demonstrat Plautus, &c.*

<sup>l</sup> Lib. I. Cap. i. Segm. 14.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 87

ters at the Altar, without whom there could have been no Sacrifice, or Offerings, or any partaking of the Offerings at the holy Table, in which the Act of Communion doth consist.

Hence as I have shew'd, and shall shew again, in the time of the Apostles the Bread, and Wine in the Holy Eucharist came to be call'd δῶρα, and προσφοραί, Gifts, and Offerings, and the Ministers of the Gospel προσεδόκοντες τὰς θυσιαστροφάς, Waiters at the Altar, and προσενέκοντες τὰ δῶρα, Offerers, or Sacrificers, their Ministration at the Lord's Table, being the most special, and excellent part of their priestly Function, in which making the Bread and Wine an holy and acceptable Sacrifice to God by solemn Oblation and <sup>m</sup> Prayer, they thereby make Intercession, and Atonement for their own Sins, and the Sins of the People, as by a most solemn Rite of Supplication according to the Nature, and Use of Sacrifices, by which God is atoned, and his Mercy and Favour procured.

I say, according to this Parallel of the Apostle between the Communion with the true God, and that of Devils, Bread, and Wine the Holy Eucharist were called Gifts, and Offerings, and the Ministers of the Gospel Offerers, and Sacrificers in the Age of the Apostles, as appears from two or three Passages in St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, who was Fellow Labourer with the Apostles, and must have understood their meaning. Saith he, Cap. xl. *Seeing then these things are very evident, it is our Duty, who have looked into the depths of Divine Knowledge, to do all things in order, whatsoever our Lord hath commanded us to do. Especially that we perform our [προσφορὰς καὶ λατρείας] Offerings, and Mini-*

---

<sup>m</sup> See the Prayer of Consecration in *Apost. Const. Lib. viii. cap. xii.* and in the Communion-Office of the Scottish Common-Prayer Book.

## 88 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

strations to God at the times appointed for them. For these he hath commanded to be done not unseasonably, and disorderly, but at certain appointed times, and hours. Wherefore he hath ordained by his sovereign Authority both where, and by whom they are to be performed, that so all things being done without fault, to all well-pleasing, they may be acceptable to his Will. They therefore who make <sup>n</sup> their Offerings at the appointed Seasons, they are blessed, and accepted, for being obedient to the Orders of the Lord, they offend not. The same order is to be observed by those who minister unto him in Divine Service. For the Chief Priest hath proper Offices assigned to him, and to the Priests is their proper Station appointed, and to the Levites belong their proper Ministrations, and the Layman is confined within the Bounds of what is commanded to Laymen. So Chapter xlv. saith he, we cannot think, that those may be justly thrown out of their Ministry, who were either appointed by the Apostles, or afterwards, by eminent Men, with the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Church, and have with all Humility, and Innocency, ministered to the Flock of Christ in Peace, and without Self-Interest, and for a long time have been approved by all: Such we think cannot be justly thrown out of their Ministry. For it would be an heinous Sin in us, if we should cast out those from their Episcopal Charge, [τὸς ἀμέμπλως καὶ ὡς οὐκ ὡς ποιεῖν τοὺς τὰ δῶρα] who without blame, or default, offer up the holy Gifts. We find the like Passage in the <sup>p</sup> Apostolical Const. in the Prayer of Consecration of a Bishop: Δὸς — ἐμὶ τὸ δέλον (ἔ τόνδε &c. give unto this thy Servant chosen by thee to be a Bishop to feed thy holy Flock, and to do the part of

<sup>n</sup> Ποιῶντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν.

<sup>p</sup> See Cotelerius's Note on the Place. Bishop Fell on C. xl. Hinc saepius in hac Epistola τὸ προσφορὰς, mentio ubi etiam Episcopi describuntur hoc charactere (ἔ elogio, quod sint προσποιεῖν τοὺς τὰ δῶρα.

<sup>p</sup> Lib. VIII. Cap. v.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 89

*an High-priest in ministring night and day to thee* (ἀ-  
μειπλως) *without blame, and making atonement in thy*  
*Presence* — [κ' προσφέρειν σοι τὰ Δῶρα τῆς ἁγίας  
Ἐκκλησίας] *and to offer up unto thee Gifts, or Oblations*  
*of thy holy Church*; and St. Cyprian hath the same  
Phrase in the next Marginal Note, which I desire  
the Reader to observe. In translating τὰ Δῶρα, I  
have added the Word *holy*, because the Bread and  
Wine in the Eucharist were called not only Δῶρα  
but ἁγία Δῶρα by the Ancients; and I must also  
observe, that as the Apostle describes the Priests  
under the Law by one of their Properties, which  
was to take Tithes: So St. Clement here, whose  
Name the Apostle tells us, was written in the Book  
of Life, calls the Presbyters of *Corinth Offerers of the*  
*Gifts* in the holy Eucharist, because it was part of  
their proper Office, and the most solemn part of it,  
to offer them up to God, as is evident from the Au-  
thorities cited in the Margin. I must also observe,  
that the Phrase [προσφέρειν τὰ Δῶρα to offer up Gifts  
is a sacrificial Expression used by St. Paul of the Leviti-  
cal Priesthood, Heb. viii. 3, 4. *For every High-Priest is*  
*ordained* [εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν Δῶρα τε κ' θυσίας] *to offer*

---

<sup>a</sup> Isaac Casaub. Exercit. xvi. ad Annot. Baronii. li. In Liturgiis antiquis, & apud patres τὰ Δῶρα, vel τὰ ἁγία Δῶρα appellantur oblationes panis, & vini ad sacram communionem in Ecclesia veteri solita offerri, propterea in Græcorum monumentis τὰ ἁγία Δῶρα, vel τὰ προσκεύη, Δῶρα, aut simpliciter τὰ Δῶρα, vel τὰ ἁγία pro ipso Christi corpore accipiuntur, vel propter jam factam consecratione, vel propter futuram, &c.

<sup>b</sup> Cyprian Epist. v. ita ut presbyteri, qui illic apud confessores offerunt, Epist. lxvii. Quæ ante oculos habentes, & sollicite, ac religiose considerantes, in ordinationibus Sacerdotum non nisi immaculatos & integros Antistites eligere debemus, qui sancte, & digne sacrificia Deo offerentes, audiri in precibus possunt, quæ faciunt pro plebis dominicæ incolumitate. In Homilia pontificis consecrantis in ordinatione Episcopi apud Habertum, p. 367. Ἐπεὶ τὰς χεῖρας, &c. Then shall you hold up your hands unto God, after that you shall offer the Gifts, and then pray for the People.

## 90 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Gifts and Sacrifices* — For if he were on Earth he should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests [ὄντων τῶν ἱερῶν τελοῦντων καὶ νόμον τὰ δῶρα] that offer Gifts according to the Law. See also Hebr. X. 11, 12. ix. 9. xi. 4. And therefore since St. Clement not only calls the Holy Eucharist an Offering, but the Ministers of it, Offerers of the holy Gifts, which is a proper sacrificial Phrase, it must needs follow, that the Lord's Table hath its proper Sacrifice, or Oblation, of which the faithful Christians are Partakers; and that they, who are appointed to minister at it, the Bishops, and Presbyters, are proper sacrificing Priests. Sir, I am discharged from proceeding any farther here by the Labours of the Learned <sup>r</sup> Mede, in his *Christian Sacrifice*, where after explaining, and defining the Nature of the Christian Sacrifice, he first shews, That the Holy Eucharist is an Oblation: Secondly, That it is an Oblation of Thanksgiving, and Prayer: Thirdly, That it is an Oblation through Jesus Christ, commemorated in the Creatures of Bread and Wine: Fourthly, That the Commemoration of Christ, according to the Stile of the ancient Church, is also a Sacrifice: Fifthly, That the Body and Blood of Christ in this mystical Service was made of Bread and Wine, which had been first offered to God, to acknowledge him the Lord of the Creature: Sixthly, That this Sacrifice was placed in Commemoration only of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross, and not in a real Offering of his Body, and Blood anew. To him, Sir, and to Dr. Grabe, in his learned Annotations on the xxxiii. and xxxiv Chapters of the iv<sup>th</sup> Book of *Irenæus*, at present I refer your late Writer for proof, that the holy Eu-

---

<sup>r</sup> See also Bishop Beveridge's *Codex Canon. Eccles. Prim. Lib. II. Cap. 10.* in his excellent Notes, *Señ. 3, 4:*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 91

charist is a real Sacrifice, ' as our Ancestors called it, and by consequence, that Bishops, and Presbyters are proper sacrificing Priests. Nay for his present Satisfaction, before I proceed to farther Authorities, I refer him to the Learned Bishop Bull, in his Answer to the Bishop of Meaux, from p. 246, to p. 252. And to the Authority of our first Reformers in the Liturgy, printed in the second Year of King Edward VI. which is in *Sion College Library*; or what is to this purpose in *Hammond l'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices*, where, not to mention the Scottish Liturgy, he will find, that our Reformers called the Lord's Table the Altar, and the holy Eucharist a Sacrifice, as well as the Minister a Priest. Sir, I hope your late Writer will admit the Composers of the Liturgies above mentioned, as well as the other Writers I have cited, to be a part of the Protestant Communion; and therefore he spoke too liberally, when he said, that the whole Protestant Communion deny Bishops to be proper Priests, and that he was mistaken, when he said, that he spoke in the Language of the Church in denying them to be Priests in the proper Sense. I may also add, that this Text in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. may also allude to the Custom the

---

' The Word by which our Saxon Ancestors called the Holy Eucharist, in Conformity to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, was *hysel*, or *hysl*, *busel*, which came from the ancient Gothick, or rather old \* German Word

*bunsel*, or *bunsl*, which signifies a Sacrifice, by leaving out (n) as in the Saxon Words *Muð*, Mouth, *Cuð*, known, and *Tuð*, Tooth, from the old Teutonick *Bunths*, *Kunths*, *Cunths*,

\* See the viii<sup>th</sup> p. of the Preface to my Saxon Grammar in the first of the two Books entituled, *Antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis Libri duo*, &c.

## 92 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Gentiles* had of sacrificing to their Gods of Hospitality at their own Feasts upon their own Tables, as may be seen in *Virgil's* description of Queen *Dido's* Entertainment of *Aneas*, and his *Trojans*, *Æn. lib. 1. v. 700. &c. to 736.*

*Dixit, & in Mensam laticum libavit honorem.*

By such offerings they used their *Tables*, as *Altars*, and made them the *Tables of Devils*, and it was as unlawful for Christians to go to such Feasts, when invited to them, as to the sacrificial Feasts in their " *DELUBRA* or *EΙΔΩΛΕΙΑ* upon Mountains in Groves, or in Temples, where I have shew'd they had consecrated Tables to eat their idolatrous Offerings upon.

X. From this I proceed to another place of the New Testament, to shew that is a Sacrifice, *viz. Rom. xv. 15, 16.* " where alluding to the ministrati-  
on of the Christian Sacrifice, in which at the Oblati-  
on of the Bread, and Wine the \* Priest, as I shall shew,  
pray'd

\* *Macrob. Saturn. Lib. iii. cap. 18.*

\* *Dr. Grabe in his Notes on Justin Martyr, p. 127.*

\* *S. Basilii opera, Tom. II. de Spiritu S. cap. xxvii.* Some of the Ordinances, and Institutions observed in the Church, we have taught us in express Words of Scripture, and some we have received as delivered in secret by Tradition from the Apostles: Both which are of like Use unto Godliness; nor doth any Man speak against these, who is the least conversant in Ecclesiastical Constitutions. For if we attempt to lay aside the unwritten Customs, and Usages of the Church, as not being of great Moment, we do not know what harm we shall all do the Gospel by our Imprudence: In all probability we shall thereby reduce the preaching of it to an empty Name. Of this sort of unwritten Usages (that I may instance first in the chief, and most common of them) let me ask, who taught us in writing to sign those with the sign of the Cross, who believe in the Name of Christ, our Lord? What Scripture hath taught us, when we pray, to turn towards the East? Or which of the holy Penmen left us in Writing *The Words of Invocation* in the Consecration of the Eucharistical Bread,  
and

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 93

pray'd unto God to send down his holy Spirit upon them, he said, ver. 15, 16. *Nevertheless, Brethren, I have written the more boldly to you in some sort, as putting you in mind of the Grace, that is given to me of God, that I should be the Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministring the Gospel of God, that the offering up the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.* The words in the Original for the offering up of the Gentiles are ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΩΝ, the Offering of the Gentiles, as the Eucharist is called by *Just. Mart.* in his Dia-

and Cup of Blessing? So *St. Chrysost. Lib. VI. de Sacerdotio.* It behoves the Priest to excel those for whom he makes Intercession, in all things, as much as a Governour should excel those, who are subject to him. And tell me, I beseech you, in what Rank shall we place him, and what degree of Purity, and Piety we may expect from him, whose Office it is to invoke the Holy Ghost, and offer up the tremendous Sacrifice, and frequently to take in his Hands the common Lord of all? What kind of Hands ought those to be, which administer such things, and what Tongue ought that to be, which utters such Words? And whose Soul ought to be more pure, and holy, than his, who receives so great a Spirit? At that time the Angels stand round about the Priest, and the whole Order of the heavenly Powers make their Acclamations, and the Place about the Altar is filled with a Choir of Angels in Honour of him, who lies thereupon. So in his III<sup>d</sup> Book of the Priesthood: Pass then from the Jewish Sacrifices to ours, and you shall see them not only wonderful, but surpassing all Admiration; for here is the Priest, who doth not bring down Fire, but the holy Spirit from Heaven, making earnest Supplication, not that a Flame should fall down from Heaven, and consume the Offering, but that the Spirit (ἡ χάρις) may descend upon the Sacrifice, and by it inflame the Souls of all [who partake thereof] and make them purer, than Silver refined in the Fire. And therefore who but a very mad Man, and out of his Wits, can despise this most tremendous Mystery. So *Isidor. Orig. Lib. VI. Sacrificium dictum quasi sacrum factum*, The Sacrifice is so called, as a sacred Fact, because it is consecrated in the Memory of our Lord's Passion; from whence, by his Command, we call it the Body, and Blood of Christ, because though it is made of the Fruits of the Earth, it is sanctified, and made a Sacrament by the invisible Operation of the Spirit of God.

logue

## 94 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

logue with Trypo in these words, p. 260. Περὶ οὗ πάντῃ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν καὶ ἰδυνῶν προσφορομύμων αὐτῶς θυσίων τέλει καὶ Ἀρχὴ καὶ Ἐυχαιρίας καὶ πόλιν οὐμοίως καὶ Ἐυχαιρίας, *But as to the Sacrifice offered up by us Gentiles in every Place, that is, of the Eucharistical Bread and Cup, the Prophet Malachi foretold it in this place.* <sup>7</sup> So Irenæus in the Margin speaks of the Eucharist, as that Sacrifice by which the same Prophet foretold God should be glorified among the Gentiles. The same place of the Prophet is cited to the same purpose by <sup>2</sup> St. Cyprian against the Jews, and by his Master Tertullian, *Adversus Marcion.* lib. iii. cap. 21. and by Just. Martyr a second time, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, p. 344. Ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. *We are the true Royal Priesthood of God, as God himself testifieth, saying, That we in every place among the Gentiles, offer up unto him acceptable and pure Sacrifices.* So p. 345. *There is no part of Mankind, either of the Barbarians, or Greeks—— among whom* <sup>a</sup> *Prayers, and Thanksgivings are not made to the Father, and Creator of all things.* By these Prayers, and Thanksgivings he means the Eucharist, as is evident from the citation in the Margin, and the preceding words, Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα, &c. *But these perfect and acceptable Sacrifices to God the Christians are only taught thankfully to make, especially in the remembrance of their dry and wet Food,* <sup>b</sup> *wherein also is commemorated the Passion, which the God of God suffered by himself.*

<sup>7</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 32. Manifestissime significans per hæc, quoniam prior quidem populus cessabit offerre Deo: omni autem loco sacrificium offerretur Deo, & hoc purum, nomen autem ejus glorificatur in Gentibus.

<sup>a</sup> *Adversus Judeos.* Lib. i. c. 16.

<sup>b</sup> These are the Words he uses in his description of the Eucharist, *Apol. i. lxxxv.* of Dr. Grabe's Edition.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐν ἡ καὶ πάλιν ὁ πόντος δι' αὐτῶν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Θεὸς μέμνηται, in the Latin, in quâ & passionis quam pertulit per ipsum Deus Deum, meminit, otherwise. In which also is commemorated the Passion, which God suffered by God himself,



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 95

So *Const. Apost. Lib. vii. cap. 30.* Τὴν ἀναστάσιμον  
 καὶ κυρίῃς ἡμέρας. *Cease not to meet on the Lord's Day,*  
*the day of our Lord's Resurrection, giving Thanks to*  
*God for the Benefits, which he through Christ hath be-*  
*stowed upon us, &c.* ὅπως ἀμεμπτῶς ἢ ἡ θυσία, *that*  
*your Sacrifice may be unblameable, and acceptable to*  
*God, who said of his Œcumenical Church [dispersed*  
*through the World]* <sup>c</sup> *In every place Incense shall be*  
*offered up to me, and a pure Offering: for I am a great*  
*King, saith the Lord Almighty, and my Name shall be*  
*great among the Gentiles.* Now if according to this  
 Primitive Notion of the Eucharist being the *Sacri-*  
*fice of the Gentiles in all Places,* ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑ ΤΩΝ  
 ΕΘΝΩΝ signified their Offering or Sacrifice, not  
 as *offered*, but as *offerers*, this Text would be a di-  
 rect and express Proof. But although the Ancients  
 always spoke of the Eucharist as the Sacrifice, or  
 Oblation of the *Gentiles*, in opposition to those of  
 the *Jews*, when they argued against them from the  
 Prophecy of *Malachi*, yet because they understood  
 the Words of the Apostle, for *the offering up of the*  
*Gentiles*, I think we ought to take them in that sense.  
 But then I think that in mentioning that Offering of  
 his, as *being sanctified by the Holy Ghost*, he plainly  
 alludes to the Ministration of the Christian Sacrifice,  
 in which they solemnly prayed unto God *to send down*  
*his Holy Spirit upon the Oblations* <sup>d</sup>. Without whom  
 being specially present *St. Cyprian* thought the Bread  
 and Wine could not be sanctified into the Body and  
 Blood of Christ. This solemn Prayer to the Holy  
 Spirit may be seen in the ancient Form of ministring  
 the Holy Sacrament hereafter set down, as we find  
 it in the *Apost. Const.* as well as in the Citations of  
 the Margin, to which I shall add these that follow.

---

<sup>c</sup> *Malachi i. 11, 14.* see the marginal Note before.

<sup>d</sup> *Epist. lxxv. quando nec oblatio illic sanctificam potest ubi Spiritus Sanctus non, &c.*

## 96 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

St. Chrysostom in his Panegyric Hom. on *Lucian* the Martyr, speaks of the Communion-Table \* as full of the Holy Ghost. St. Cyprian calls it, *Spiritalem mensam*; and Greg. Nazian. and Chrysostom, *τράπεζαν ἁγίου πνεύματος*, *The Table of the Holy Spirit*. In the ancient Liturgies nothing is more common, than the Prayers of the Priest to God, to send down his Holy Spirit upon himself, and the Communicants and the Oblations. So in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom of Goar's Edition, p. 72. Καὶ ἱδύωσον, &c. *And make me fit, by the Power of the Holy Ghost, — to officiate at this Holy Table, and consecrate thy holy, and immaculate Body, and thy precious Blood.* And p. 77. Ἐνὶ προσφύτοις, &c. *We also offer up unto thee this reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifice, and pray, and beseech, and supplicate thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts.* So in the Liturgy of St. Basil, p. 162. Σὺ ἱδύωσον, &c. *Thou, O Lord, by the Power of the Holy Ghost make me fit for this Ministration.* So p. 163. Σὺ ἐνίσχυσον, &c. *Strengthen me with the Power of thy Holy Spirit in this Ministration.* So p. 164. Σὺ εἰ ὁ θεὸς, &c. *Thou art he, who hast placed us in this Ministration by the Power of thy Holy Spirit.* So p. 169. Δεόμεθα, &c. *We who minister at thy Altar, pray, and beseech thee, that thy Holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these Gifts, which lie before thee, to bless, and sanctify them, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ.*

Those who desire to have more Authorities of this kind may find many more in *Habertus's* Greek Pontifical, *Observat. iv. ad partem x. Liturg. Ordin.* From all which it will appear, that the ancient Church thought the *Holy Spirit* to be most especially present at the Eucharistical Sacrifice, and to be the

\* Τράπεζης ἐμνήσθη ἑτέρας τ' φεικώδους, καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος Γεμεύσης

† Ἀναδείξαι. See If. Casaubon. Exercit. in Baron. xvi. cap. 33.

‡ Ἀρθροποι-κόσμου κόσμον ἀναδείξας. Const. Apost. lib. viii. cap. 12.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 97

chief Agent in the Ministration of it; who as *Maximus* and *Cabasilas* both express themselves, sanctifies the Gifts by the Hand and Tongue of the Priest. The Holy Ghost then is the principal, and the Priests but the instrumental Ministers in the Ministration of the Eucharistical Oblation, *Συνεργοὶ καὶ ἄγιοι ἀνδράνες*, Co-agents or Workers together with the Holy Spirit in the Ministration of it, even as <sup>a</sup> St. Paul saith that he, and the other Apostles were in preaching the Gospel, and planting Churches in the World. This part which the Holy Spirit hath in the Ministration of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, inclines me to think, that where it is <sup>b</sup> written, that *Christ offered up himself by the eternal Spirit*, the place is not to be understood *impellente Spiritu*, by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, as some expound it, nor by his own Divinity, or Godhead, as others; but by the Presence and Com-ministration of the Holy Spirit, who was assisting to him in that Oblation of himself, for the Sins of the World. But this I submit to the Judgment of Learned Men.

From all that I have said, or cited out of the solemn Prayers which were made to God in the Administration of the Eucharist, to send down his Holy Spirit upon the Priest, the Sacrifice, and the People, and from his mighty most special Assistance, and chief Ministration in the holy Action; particularly, in the sanctifying the Oblations, I say, I cannot from considering all this, but think it very probable, that the Apostle alluded to the common Notion the Christians had of the Eucharistical Oblations being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, in saying that the Oblation he made of the *Gentiles*, was *acceptable to God, being* [like the Eucharistical Bread, and Wine] *sanctified by the Holy Ghost*.

---

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 9. *Θεὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ συνεργός*. 2 Cor. vi. 1. *Συνεργήσῃτε ὁ, &c.* <sup>b</sup> Heb. ix. 14.

## 98 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

After all this I take the liberty to paraphrase the Text thus : *Nevertheless, Brethren, I have written more boldly to you in some sort, desiring to put you in mind of the things you know, because of the Honour of the Apostolical Office, which is given me of God, that according to the Prophecy of <sup>i</sup>Isaiab, I should be the Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, to bring your Brethren out of all Nations for an Offering unto the Lord, ministring the Gospel of God <sup>k</sup> as in my priestly Office, that the offering up, or Sacrifice of the converted Gentiles by me as an Evangelical Priest to God, might be acceptable to him, <sup>l</sup> being not like the legal Sacrifices of Beasts seasoned with Salt, but like the Evangelical Offering of the Holy Eucharist, <sup>m</sup> sanctified by the Holy Ghost.* The Word here, *Minister* of Jesus Christ, is λειτουργός, which, as I observed above, is the Word by which the Greek Version often renders the Hebrew *Cohen*, which at other

<sup>i</sup> Chap. lxvi. 20. Ainsworth Annot. on Levit. ii. Secondly, the Mincha figured the Persons of Christians, who through him are sanctified, and cleansed to be pure Oblations unto God, as it was prophesied : *They shall bring all your Brethren for a Minchah, (a Meat-Offering) unto the Lord of all the Gentiles, &c. as the Sons of Israel bring a Minchah in a clean Vessel unto the House of the Lord,* Isai. xli. 20. The Accomplishment whereof the Apostle sheweth to have been by his Ministration of the Gospel of God unto the Gentiles, that the Oblation (Prophora) of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, Rom. xv. 16.

<sup>k</sup> *Ut sim Jesu Christi minister inter Gentes Sacerdotali munere exercens Evangelium Dei,* Vers. Arab.

<sup>l</sup> So Grotius on the place : *Ut factis probem me ministrum esse Christi ad Gentes missum, dum obo Sacerdotium non Leviticum sed Christianum ex Vaticinio Isaia lxvi. 21. non pecudes Deo offerens, sed homines multos per me ad Deum conversos. Persistit in similitudine Victimæ : ideo dicit λειτουργός, &c.*

<sup>m</sup> Castal. *Ut extraneorum libatio accepta sit per Sanctum consecrata Spiritum.* Which Words seem to intimate that he thought that *προσφορά* ἡ ἑσθρον, signifies not the offering up of the Gentiles, but the offering of the Gentiles, as the Holy Eucharist is called in opposition to the Jewish offerings ; but the Words are to be understood in the allusive Senses, as the Church always understand them.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 99

times they translate by ἱερεὺς, *Priest*; and had the Apostle written this Epistle in Hebrew, I am of Opinion, that the Translation would have been, *That I should be the Priest of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles*. But ἱερεργεύλα being added to λειτουργόν, makes it signify a Priest; for a Priest [ἱερεὺς, *Sacerdos*] cannot be better defined, than that he is λειτουργός ἱερεργεῶν, *" Sacrorum publicus Minister, Minister rem sacram operans, Minister fungens administratione sacrorum*. A Minister of holy things, or a Minister about holy things, the same with ὁ τὰ ἱερά ἐργαζόμενος, *res sacras faciens, i. e. a Priest*, 1 Cor. ix. 13. Do you not know, saith the Apostle, that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the Temple, i. e. do you not know that the Priests live, or are maintained, of the things of the Temple? So ἱερεργεύλα in Hesychius is glossed by προσφεροῦντα θυσιάαν, *a sacrificing Minister*; and the Apostle continuing his Metaphor in Terms belonging to the Priesthood, he saith, ἔχω ἐν καύχησιν ἐν χρεῖσιν ἰνσὶ ταῖς τιποῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, *I have therefore whereof I may glory through Christ Jesus, as to my Priestly Ministration, in things pertaining to God*. Wherefore as the Apostle's Allusion to the Christian Offering, which was sanctified, or made holy by the Descent of the Holy Ghost, obliged him to call his Offering up of the converted Gentiles, an Offering, or Sacrifice, and himself λειτουργόν ἱερεργεύλα τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, *a Priest of the Gospel*, in that respect: So it proves the Holy Eucharist, to which that Allusion was made, to be a proper Sacrifice, and the Ministers who offer it to be proper sacrificing Priests. Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, having related how Jesus Christ commanded the Apostles, after his Example, to take the Bread, and when they had solemnly given Thanks, to say, *This is my Body, this do*

<sup>a</sup> See Erasmus on the place.

# 100 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

in remembrance of me; and in like manner to take the Cup, and when they had solemnly given Thanks, to say, *This is my Blood*, he observes to the Gentiles that the wicked Dæmons had by way of Imitation, commanded the same to be done in the ° Sacraments of *Mithra*. For, saith he, *you either know, or may know for certain, that a Loaf, and a Cup of Water, with a Form of Words, was used<sup>p</sup> in the solemn Sacrifices for him, who was initiated in that Religion*, meaning, as he had shewn, that the Holy Eucharist was administered immediately upon the Baptism, or Initiation of Men into the Christian Religion, and his Parallel between the two Mysteries, and Initiation implies, that the Oblation of the Eucharistical Bread, and Wine was<sup>q</sup> τελετή, a solemn material Sacrifice in the Opinion of the Christians, as the Oblation of the other diabolical Bread, and Water was in the Mysteries of *Mithra*, and by consequence that their Bishops and Presbyters, who were Ministers of Baptism, and the Holy Eucharist, were τελεσται, as<sup>r</sup> *Pollux* calls Priests, even as<sup>s</sup> proper Priests, as the Priests of *Mithra*, or the Sun were esteemed by his Worshippers to be. \* The degrees or introduction to any Religion were three, καθαρσις, Purgation,

\* So Tertullian de Præscript. c. 40. *A Diabolo scilicet, cujus sunt partes intervertendi veritatem. Qui ipsas quoque res Sacramentorum divinatorum idolorum mysteriis emulatur. Tingit & ipse quosdam, utique credentes, & fideles suos: expositionem delictorum de lavacro promittit; & si adhuc memini, Mithra signat illic in frontibus milites suos, celebrat & panis oblationem, & imaginem resurrectionis inducit, & sub gladio redimit coronam.*

<sup>p</sup> Εν ταῖς τ μνημονεύει τελεσταις.

<sup>q</sup> Habert. Pontiff. p. 335, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Suidas. Τελετή. Θυσία μυστηριώδης, ἡ μεγίστη, καὶ τιμωτέρα, Telete. Sacrificium Mysteriorum, plenum, maximum, honoratissimum.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. I. cap. 1. Sægm. 14.

<sup>t</sup> Habert. Pontiff. 125, 140, 144, 152, 283. Cyprian de Oratione Domin. p. 149, 150. Sursum Cord. Cyprian de Orat. Dom. p. 152.

\* Habert. Pontiff. 335, 283.

Μύησις,

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 101

Μύσθις, *Initiation*, and τελείωσις, *Consummation*, which was by Sacrifice; and therefore Sacrifice was called τελειή, because it was the *Consummation* and Perfection of all the Rites, by which Men were initiated into the Worship and Religion of any God; and likewise because it was the last Rite by which Excommunicates were reconcil'd to their Gods upon their Repentance. Hence the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist came to be call'd τὸ ΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ, *Perfection*, as that which finisheth the Initiation of a Christian, and the Reconciliation of a Christian Penitent. It is so called " in six several Canons of the Council of *Ancyra*, relating to the re-admission of Penitents, Lapsed, Adulterers, and Murderers, to the Peace and perfect Communion of the Church. But to return to St. *Justin*, he speaks to the same purpose in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the Jew, p. 259, 260. And the " *Meat offering of fine Flower*, which was appointed to be offered for those who were cleansed from the Leprosy, was a Type of the Eucharistical Bread, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded to be offered in remembrance of his Passion, which he suffered for those, whose Souls are purged from all Sins, that we might give Thanks to God, for creating the World, and all things therein for Man, and for delivering us from all the Wickedness of which we were guilty, and for conquering the Principalities, and Powers with a compleat Victory. And therefore God by Malachy, who was one of the twelve Prophets, speaks of the Sacrifices, which you then offered, thus. \* I have no Pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, neither will I accept an Offering at your Hand; for from the rising of the Sun, unto the going down of the same, my Name shall be

---

" Can. 4, 5, 6, 9, 22, 23. Isaac Casaubon. in Exercit. xvi. ad Annal. Baron. xlviii. Quare τὸ τέλειον perfectio, & consummatio est ipsa Eucharistia, quæ etiam Dionysio dicitur τελείωσις, &c.

" Lev. xiv. 10.

\* Malach. ii. 10, 11.

## 102 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense shall be offered unto my Name, and a pure Offering, for my Name shall be great among the Heathen, saith the Lord, but you have profaned it. But of the Sacrifice of the Gentiles offered by us in every place, that is to say, of the Bread of the Eucharist, and Cup of the Eucharist, he then spoke before-hand, saying, that we glorified his Name, and you profaned it. To the same purpose speaks <sup>1</sup> Irenæus: Our Lord appointing his Disciples to offer unto God the First Fruits of his Creatures, not as if he had need of them, but that they might not be unfruitful, and ungrateful, took the Creature of Bread, and gave Thanks, saying, This is my Body. In like manner, taking the Cup, [of Wine] which is one of the Creatures among us, he called it his Blood, and <sup>2</sup> instituted the new Oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers to God throughout the whole World, to that God who gives us Food, [as being] the First Fruits of his Gifts in the New Testament, of which Malachi, one of the Twelve [minor] Prophets prophesied in these Words: *I have no pleasure in you, &c. manifestly signifying by these Words, that his former People should cease to offer any more to God, but that Sacrifice should be offered to him in every place;*

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 32. Dominus— suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis Creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut nec ipsi infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex Creatura est panis, accepit, & gratias egit dicens: Hoc est Corpus meum. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea Creatura, quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, & Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimento nobis præstat, primitias suorum munerum in Nova Testamento, de quo in duodecim Prophetis Malachias sic præsignificavit. Non est mihi voluntas in vobis dicit Dominus, &c. Manifestissime significans per hæc, quoniam prior quidem populus cessavit offerre Deo, omni autem loco sacrificium offertur Deo, & hoc purum, nomen autem ejus glorificatur in Gentibus. See Dr. Grabe's Notes.

<sup>2</sup> Docuit. Ἐδίδαξεν. Διδάσκων de Præcipiente dicitur. Budæus in comm. Ling. Græcæ, p. 762.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 103

and this pure one [of which the Prophet spake] that his Name might be glorified among the Gentiles. To the same purpose also speaks *Eusebius*, in his Commentary on *Psalms* li. and the last Verse. But *Symmachus* saith, Thou shalt receive, instead of thou shalt accept, an Offering, and Holocausts, to wit, of Righteousness; and moreover adds Calves. For all are Offerings of Righteousness, according to the spiritual Sacrifice without Blood, which are offered through the whole World. In another of the Jewish Prophets it is also said, *I have no pleasure* ——— And in every place Incense, and a pure Sacrifice shall be offered to my Name. This is now called the Sacrifice of Righteousness, and also of Praise, as he called it in the foregoing Psalm, saying, Offer up to God the Sacrifice of Praise. See also his Comment on *Isaiah* xviii. 7.

I believe no Man in the World, that was of any Religion where Sacrifice was used, and that by chance should see the Sacrament of the Holy <sup>a</sup> Eucharist, administered among Christians, as it was administered in the primitive Times, or as it is administered according to the Order, and Usage of the Church of England, but would take the Bread and Wine for an Offering or Sacrifice, and the whole Action for a sacrificial Ministration; and the Eating and Drinking of the Holy Elements, for a sacrificial Entertainment of the Congregation at the Table of their God. To see <sup>b</sup> Bread, and Wine <sup>c</sup> mixed with Water, so solemnly brought to the Table, and then

---

<sup>a</sup> Πανσυνήκων ἡμῶν τὸ εὐχῆς ἀγρὸν προσφέρει, &c. *Just. Mart. Apol. i.*

<sup>b</sup> Ἄξιόν προσφέρει, καὶ οἶνον, καὶ ὕδωρ. *Just. Mart. Apol. i.*  
 Ἐπειὰ προσφέρει τὸ προσέσῃ τὸ ἀδελφῶν ἀξιόν καὶ πόσκειον ὕδαλόν καὶ κραμαλόν. *Idem ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> This was the Practice of our Church at the Reformation, as may be seen in the Rubrick of the Communion Office of the first Common-Prayer Book of *Edw. VI.* See also *Dr. Grabe's Notes* on τὸ κλεραμύζον πόσκειον, in *Irenæus, Lib. V. cap. 11.*

# 104 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

a Loaf of that Bread, and a Cup of that Wine, brought by the Deacon in manner of an Offering to the *Liturg*, or Minister, which he also taking in his Hands, as an Offering, sets them with all Reverence on the Table, and then after solemn Prayers of Oblation, and Consecration, to see him take up the Bread, and say, in a most solemn manner, *This is my Body, &c.* and then the Cup, saying, as solemnly, *This is my Blood, &c.* and then to hear him, with all the Powers of his Soul, offer up Praises, and Glory, and Thanksgiving, and Prayers to God, the Father of all things, thro' the Name of the Son, and Holy Spirit, which they beseech him to send down upon the Bread and Cup, and the People with the greatest Harmony and Acclamation, saying aloud, *Amen.* After which also to see the *Liturg* first eat of the Bread, and drink of the Cup, and then the Deacon to carry about the Blessed Bread and Wine, to be eaten and drank by the People, as in a sacrificial Feast; and lastly, to see and hear all concluded with Psalms, and Hymns of Praise, and Prayers of Intercession to God with the highest <sup>d</sup> *pomp-like Celebrity* of Words. I say, to see and hear all this, would make an *uninitiated* Heathen conclude, that the Bread and Wine were an Offering, the whole Eucharistical Action a sacrificial Mystery; the eating and drinking the sanctified Elements, a sacrificial Banquet, and the *Liturg*, who administered, a Priest. I have here used the Term *sacrificial Mystery*, because there was no fœderal Sacrifice, but what was a religious Mystery, exhibiting one thing to the Sense, and another to the Understanding of the Votist, or what was not an outward Sign of an invisible inward Grace of the God, true, or believed to be true, to whom the Sacrifice was

<sup>d</sup> Διὰ λόγου πομπᾶς, καὶ ὕμνων πένπτης. *Just. Mart. Apol. 1. Edit. Oxon. p. 23.*

offered :

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 105

offered : I say, every fœderal Sacrifice, is an outward Sign of an invisible Grace, and by consequence is a Myſtery, or Sacrament ; for *Sacrament* in the Latin Church, from which we borrowed the Word, ſignifies the ſame, as *Myſtery* in the Greek, and therefore the Eucharistical Sacrifice is alſo a Sacrament, or to ſpeak more properly of it, it is a Chriſtian Sacrament or Myſtery as a Fœderal Commemorative Sacrifice, in which as Chriſt repreſents unto God his Paſſion, and the Merits of it, as our High-Prieſt in Heaven : So in this Sacrifice the Prieſts upon Earth in Conjunction with it, preſent, and commemorate the ſame unto him, by ſetting before him the Symbols of his dead Body, and Blood, effus'd for our Sins.

I ſpeak this to let the reformed World ſee, that they need not be afraid of believing the Holy Eucharift to be a proper Sacrifice, or Offering, in which

---

\* *Chryſoſt. de ſacerdotio, Lib. III.* Οὐρανὸς ἰδὼς, When thou ſhalt ſee the Lord ſacrificed, and the Prieſt ſtanding over the Sacrifice, and pouring out Prayers, and the People died red with his Blood, canſt thou think thou art among Men, or upon the Earth, or that thou art tranſlated into Heaven? *Baſil de Baptiſmo, Lib. II. quaſt. II.* But when the Lord ſaid a greater than *Solomon* is here, he thereby taught us, how much more wicked he is, who being impure, dares offer up the Body of our Lord, who gave himſelf for us an Offering, and Sacrifice to God. *Eulogius Alexandrinus Photii. Bibl. p. 116. 2.* Here the Apoſtle (*Heb. x. 46.*) doth not forbid all Sacrifice, but the legal Sacrifices, nor doth he abſolutely diſcharge all Sacrifice, but threatens the laſt Judgment to thoſe, who after they had acknowledged the Truth, and been Partakers of the Myſtical Sacrifice, returned to the Legal Sacrifices by Calves, and Bulls. — Wherefore as he forbids them the legal Baptiſm, ſo he forbids them the bloody Sacrifices of the Law, — for the tremendous Sacrifice of the Body of our Lord, which is offered among us, is not an Inſtitution of different Sacrifices, but a Commemoration of the Sacrifice once offered for us. For, ſaith he, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and therefore as often as we do it, we do ſhew forth the Death of our Lord. *Iſidor. Orig. Lib. VI.* Duo autem ſunt, quæ offeruntur, Donum, & Sacrificium,

## 106 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

which the Bread, and Wine are offered in a proper and literal sense, and that by consequence the Ministers of it are properly, and literally speaking *Offering Priests*, as the Primitive Christians, and all Churches before the Reformation taught, and believed. But then, I must say again upon Supposition, that, like Baptism, it is only a *Sacrament*, or religious Mystery, and not a Sacrifice, that according to the Notion of *Priest and Priesthood*, as I have before explained it out of profane, and holy Writers, the Ministers of it must be Priests. For to be taken from among Men to perform all the most holy Solemnities above-mentioned, pertaining unto God, to have Authority from him to represent before him the Passion of his Son, and the Merits of it on Earth, as he doth in Heaven, and in Virtue of it to intercede unto him for the People, for whom he performs the holy Mystery, and to admit them in his Name to feast at his Table, and to deliver unto them the Bread, and Wine, as Pledges of his Love, and Seals of Pardon: To minister in this manner in the most intimate Act of Communion that can be betwixt God, and Man, as fully answers the Notion, and Character of a Priest, as to offer Sacrifice, and the Signification of

---

ficiam, &c. There are two things which are offered to God, *Gifts*, and *Sacrifices*. *Gifts*, consist in Gold, or Silver, or any other *Species*, which is offered. But *Sacrifices* are Victims, and whatsoever is burnt, or placed upon the Altar. — *Immolation* was so called by the Ancients, because the Victim to be slain was brought to the Mole [or Bulk] of the Altar, and there slain, and therefore *Mactation*, was after *Immolation*. But now *Immolation* is agreeably said of the Bread, and the Cup, but *Libation* is properly the Oblation of the Cup only. *Eusebius Cæsariensis* in *Psalm* xlv, v. 7, 8. He means the rational and spiritual Sacrifices, which we see are daily offered up by the Priests for the Faithful. To these may be added the Jewish Doctors, who taught, that under the *Messias* all Sacrifices should cease, but that of Bread, and Wine, cited in that most excellent Tract, of, *The Great Duty of Frequenting the Christian Sacrifice*, lately written, and publish'd by Mr. Nelson.

τ δὲ γινώσκω



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 107

τῶν ἁγίων λειτεργός, ιερουργεῖν, ἱερὰ ἐργάζεσθαι in the divine Writings, and of δοῦν, ρέζειν, and ἔρδειν in profane Authors, which by special Usage, were applied to the Action of sacrificing, as properly belong to any other ministerial Action as holy, and solemn as sacrificing, which the publick *Liturg* performs by God's Appointment, but more especially to ministerial Actions, in which there are religious Mysteries, external Signs, mystical Rites, and manual Operations, as taking, and breaking of Bread, and taking, and pouring out Wine, and feasting upon them, as God's Entertainment, and concluding all with most solemn Acts of Intercession. These are τὰ Θεία, most holy Performances, as holy, and solemn, as any Sacrifice, and pertaining as much to God, and therefore he that by God's Appointment administers in such holy and mystical Rites, and Offices, cannot but be λειτεργός ιερουργῶν, which I said before was the Definition of a Priest. I have said this upon mere supposition, by granting more than I should, for the more effectual Conviction of your *late Author*. For the holy Eucharist is so very like a Sacrifice, or sacrificial Mystery in all its Rites, and manner of Ministration, that if it be not a Sacrifice, no Man can well tell what the common Notion of a Sacrifice is, or easily distinguish it from the Nature of any Sacrifice, upon which the Votists used to feast in the Temple, and at the Altar of their God. The Primitive Christians, who were as afraid of Idolatry, as any of the Protestants, were so far from not having this Notion of it, or being afraid to own it as such, that as they believed *Melchisedech* was a Type of Christ: <sup>c</sup> So they believed the Bread and Wine, which

---

<sup>c</sup> Et Melchisedech Rex Salem protulit Panem & Vinum, Fuit autem Sacerdos Dei Summi, & benedixit Abraham. Quod autem Melchisedech typum Christi portaret declarat in Psalmus Spiritus Sanctus. — Secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Qui Ordo utique hic est de Sacrifi-

## 108 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

which he brought forth to *Abraham*, when he blessed him, to have been a Type of this commemorative Sacrifice by Bread and Wine, which Christ instituted for his Church. They believed it to be that <sup>s</sup> *Mincha purum*, that pure Offering foretold by the

*Sacrificio illo veniens & inde descendens, quod Melchisedech Sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod Panem, & Vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit. Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei Summi, quam Dominus noster Jesus Christus? Qui Sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem, quod Melchisedech obtulerat, i. e. Panem & Vinum, suum scilicet Corpus & Sanguinem. Et circa Abraham benedictio illa precedens, ad nostrum populum pertinebat, &c. Cyprian. Ep. LXIII. Edit. Oxon. See Grotius upon the Place:*

<sup>s</sup> *Cur itaque postea per Prophetas prædicat spiritus futurum, ut in omni terra, aut in omni loco offerantur Sacrificia Deo, sicut per Malachiam Angelum unum ex xiii. Prophetis: Non recipiam Sacrificium de manibus vestris, quoniam ab oriente sole usque ad occidentem nomen meum clarificatum est in omnibus gentibus dicit Dominus Omnipotens, & in omni loco offeruntur Sacrificia munda nomine meo. Tertull. Adversus Judæos. C. 5. So contra Marcion. Lib. III. Cap. 22. Μηχισεδέκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, ὁ ἱερεὺς τῷ θεῷ ὕψιστῃ, ὁ τῷ οἶνον καὶ τῷ ἄρτον τῷ ἡσυχαστῶν διδόντες τροφὴν, αἷς τῶν θυχαιρίων. Clemen. Alex. Strom. Lib. IV. p. 539. So St. Ambrose in Epist. ad Hebr. Cap. v. Hujus ordinem Sacrificii per mysticam similitudinem Melchisedech justissimus Rex instituit, quando Domino Panis & Vini fructus obtulit. Constat enim pecudum victimas perisse, quæ fuerunt ordinis Aaron, non Melchisedech. Sed hoc manere potius institutum, quod toto orbe in Sacramentorum erogatione celebratur. Cap. vii. Neque carnes, & sanguinis victimas immolaverit & brutorum sanguinem animalium dextra suscepit, sed Pane & Vino simplici puroque Sacrificio Christi dedicaverit sacerdotium. Which perhaps should be read Sacramentum, as in the Words of St. Hierom, cited below out of his Epistle to Evagrius, Tom. III. of the Basil Edition. Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Ordinem autem ejus multis modis interpretantur, quod solus, & Rex fuerit, & sacerdos, & ante Circumcisionem functus Sacerdotio, ut non gentes ex Judæis, sed Judæi & Gentibus sacerdotium acceperint; neque unctus oleo sacerdotali, ac Moysis præcepta constituent, sed oleo exultationis, & fidei puritate; neque carnis & sanguinis victimis, immolaverit, & brutorum sanguinem, eorum animalium exta, id est, quicquid super escam est, suscepit, sed Pane & Vino simplice, puroque Sacrificio, Christi dedicaverit Sacramentum. Petrus de Marca de Sacrificio Missæ ——— Hoc esse*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 109

the Prophet *Malachi*, which should be offered in every Place, and not in one, as among the *Jews*, unto the Name of God among the *Gentiles*, from the rising of the Sun unto the going down of the same. Hence they called it to distinguish it from the *Jewish* Sacrifices' *θυσίαν λογικὴν, ἢ ἀναιμακτόν*, *Sacrificium rationale & incruentum*, the *Spiritual and Unbloody Sacrifice*, or *Offering without Slaughter, and Blood*. And accordingly the <sup>h</sup> Fathers in the first Council of *Nice*, speaking of the *Mystery* or *Sacrament* of the Body, and Blood of Christ, express themselves in this manner; *When we are at the Lord's Table let us not with low Thoughts attend to the Bread and Cup set thereupon, but exalting our Minds, let us by Faith conceive, that <sup>i</sup> the Lamb of God, which*  
*taketh*

---

*esse Melchisedechi Sacrificium, qui Panis & Vini species Deo prius ab se oblatas, ut decebat sacerdotem Altissimi, ad agendas de Abrahamæ victoria gratias, ipsi dein, atque commilitonibus edendas bibendasque præbuit, ut Sacrificii participes omnes faceret — Cujus Exemplo Christus, Pane & Vino prolatis in ultima mensa Deo gratias egit — quare frugum illarum Sacrificium à Melchisedecho ad Dei venerationem adhibitum, typus fuit veri Sacrificii à Christo instituti. See also St. Hieron. in Matth. de Consecr. dist. 2. Assumpsit panem, qui confortator est hominis, & ad verum pascha transit Sacramentum, ut quomodo in præfigurationem ejus Melchisedech Panem & Vinum offerens fecerat, ipse in veritate corporis, & sanguinis sui representaret.*

<sup>h</sup> *Gelasii Cyzic. Hist. Conc. Nicen. Cap. xxx.*

<sup>i</sup> *Τὸν ἀμὲν τῷ Θεῷ, — ἀθύτως καὶ τῷ ἱερῶν θυόμυρον.* *Agnum illum Dei — Incruente a Sacerdotibus immolatum.* So the Words are translated truly and properly by *Rob. Balfore*, who first published *Gelasius's History* of the 1. Conc. of *Nice* at *Paris*, *M.D.C.* For as *θύω* in the primary Sense signifies to kill, or slay, *Matth. xxii. 4. Luke xv. 23, 24. John x. 10. Acts x. 13.* so *Ἀθύω* from whence *Ἀθύτως* in its primary Sense signifies *non mactatus*, not killed, or slain. But as *θύω* in its secondary Sense signifies to Sacrifice, or offer Animals by slaughter, or mactation, and thence again to offer, or Sacrifice in the most general Sense. So the holy Fathers said, that in the Holy Eucharist the Lamb of God was offered or sacrificed *ἀθύτως*, incruente without Blood, or being slain. Indeed *Ἀθύω* also signifies *non sacrificatus*, not offered, or sacrificed,

# 110 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

taketh away the Sin of the World is placed upon the Holy Table, and offered or sacrificed by the Priests in an unbloody Oblation, and that we receiving his precious

crificed, and that both in a literal and figurative Sense. First, in a literal Sense, as in that Passage of *Athenæus*, Lib. iv. where he saith of *Epicurus*, ἄβυστος ἐσθ' πολλὰ καὶ κρέας, that he frequently eats Flesh, whereof he offered no part to the Gods. To the right understanding of which I must transcribe the Words of *J. Casaubon*, in his Notes on Lib. i. cap. 11. of *Athenæus*. Observamus Græcos Scriptores ἐσθ' appellare non solum viçimas, quæ vere ἱερῶν, & in sacrificiorum usum mactantur, verum omnia quæcunque ad comedendum jugulantur Animalia. Satis constat tam ex sacris, quam ex aliis literis. Primis temporibus ignota hominibus Carnium manducatione, tantum in honorem numinis mactari solitas hostias. Piguit postea mortales olerum, & ἄβυστος τροφῆς: Itaque cepere etiam ipsi carnibus vesci, sed parçè initio ——— nunquam autem ulum Animal in proprias usus mactabant, quin ejus aliquam partem Deo consecrarent adolendam. Qui secus facerent proverbio notato ἄβυστος ἑρπ' καὶ κρέας, Quod de homine improbo impioque dici solitum. So in *Suidas*; ἄβυστος. Ἀνδ' Θυσίων, & γῆρας ἄβυστος τε & ἀγάμους γάμους ἐκείνους, Having solemnized Marriage without Sacrifice. And in the same Word, Ἐδ' ἔτο μ' οἱ τὸ Σῶμα κρεοφαγίας, ἄβυστος ὃ ἐν ἡνέχελῳ μελαλασσόν, His Body required eating of Flesh, but he never eat of it, before some part was offered in Sacrifice to the Gods. Secondly, ΑΘΥΤΟΣ signifies not sacrificed in a figurative Sense, when the Sacrifice, or Offering is not accepted by reason of some defect in the Offerer, or Offering, and is therefore deemed as no Sacrifice. So *Philo de vita Mosis*, lib. iii. p. 669. Saith the Sacrifices of the Wicked are ἄβυστοι Θυσίαι, & ἀνιεγὼ ἱερουργίας, Sacrifices not sacrificed, and unholy Oblations. And elsewhere in the same Book, θυσίας ἄβυστος ἀνίστασθαι, They offered profane, unhallow'd abominable Sacrifices; that is, profane polluted Sacrifices in the same Sense, as the Greeks called null Marriages Γάμους ἀγάμους; and a Gift of an Enemy ΔΩΠΟΝ ΑΔΩΠΟΝ, as being a Gift, which in effect was no Gift. Now in the literal Sense of ἄβυστος, the Lamb of God cannot be said not to be offered at all in the Eucharist, because his representative Body, and Blood were literally offered, and presented to God upon the holy Table, as is plainer from all Antiquity, than to need proof. Nor secondly, could it be the intention of the *Nicene Fathers* to say, that Christ in the Holy Eucharist was not offered in this figurative Sense, for that had been to assert, that the Propitiatory Oblation of the Eucharist for the Remission of Sins, and the Resurrection unto Life



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 111

precious Body, and Blood believe them to be the Symbols, [or Pledges] of our Resurrection, for the same reason they called the *H. Eucharist*, ἁγία ἑσφία, *hostiam mundam, puram* a pure Offering, because pure from Violence, and Blood, as in the Words of *Constantine* the Great, in the twelfth Chapter of his Oration to the Church of the Saints, where speaking of the Commemoration of Martyrs in the holy Eucharist: he saith, *Such Eucharistical Sacrifice as is performed in Commemoration of these Men, as is pure from Blood, and all Violence, in which also there is no need of the Odour of Incense, or of Fire, but only of as much pure Light, as is sufficient to give Light to the Worshippers.* So *St. Chrysostom* in his Homily on *St. Eustathius* saith, the initiated knew ὅτι ἑσφία καὶ ὕψος αἵματος, that there is a Sacrifice without Blood: They also called it [ἑσφία αἰνεσιῶν] a Sacrifice of Praise, according to what <sup>k</sup> *Buxtorf* tells us some Rabbins said, that the Sacrifice of Praise should never cease. And agreeably to what <sup>l</sup> *St. Peter* the Apostle of the Circumcision saith, to the whole House, or Family of Christians converted from Judaism, Ye also as lively Stones are built up a spiritual House <sup>m</sup> into an holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices [of which the holy Eucharist is the chief] acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. This spiritual House, built of unconverted Jews, and Gentiles into an holy Priesthood, was a political House, or Society, of which Jesus Christ, whom he calls the living precious Corner-stone, was the supream Head, and Governour. For as the Head, and Governour of every

---

Life Eternal, had been a profane, polluted, and vain Oblation; and therefore ἁγία ἑσφία, in the Passage here cited, can only signify offered, but not slain, offered, or sacrificed without *Mactation*, or Blood.

<sup>k</sup> Lexicon Rabbin. in קרבן.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Epist. Chap. ii. v. 5.

<sup>m</sup> *Ἐς παρρησίαν* Steph. D. 1. Alex. N. 1. Barb. 5. nov. 4. Gen. Æthiop. Dr. *Milles's* Gr. Test.

political

## 112 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

political House is what the Corner-stone is to a Building, the Strength, and Support of it, and as this spiritual House must be taken for the political House of God's Church, as it is taken, *Hebr. iii. 5, 6.* in these Words, *Whose House we are:* So the *holy Priesthood* mentioned here, is not to be taken for the Priestly Function, or Office, as if all *Christians were Priests*, but for the Priestly Polity, and Government of the Church, which is the House of God. It is also taken in the same Sense in the *ix<sup>th</sup>* Verse, where the whole Body of Christians, like the Jewish People, <sup>a</sup> *Exod. xix. 6.* is said to be a *chosen Generation, a Royal Priesthood, and holy Nation, and a peculiar People*, which was as true in the proper political Sence of the Christians, as it was of the Jews, because the Church as one spiritual Body politick hath Jesus Christ for its supreme Governour, who is both King, and Priest. This Polity of his Kingdom is properly expressed by a Royal or Kingly Priesthood, in which the Christians are governed, as the Jews in their Theocracy were, by a Priest, who was a secular, as well as a sacerdotal Minister, and a Type of Christ, who is both King, and Priest of his Church. To this purpose speaks *St. Clement* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Cap. lvi. *Now God (saith he) the Seer of all things, the Father and Ruler of all Spirits, and Lord of all Flesh,*

---

<sup>a</sup> *Fagius* upon the Place. *Regnum Sacerdotale, vel Sacerdotum h. e. Regnum non profanum, quod ex opibus, & Armis, sed quod ex Sacerdotibus, rebus sacris, ac divinis constat, q. d. Sacrum & divinum erit hoc regnum. Nemo dubitet Spiritum Sanctum hic potissimum respexisse ad Christum, qui est verus ille Rex, & Sacerdos, qui tandem ex populo Judaico secundum promissiones Dei proditurus erat. Quandoquidem autem una est Judaeorum, & Gentium fides, unus Deus, unaque Ecclesia, cum ad vitæ innocentiam, & puritatem Christianum populum hortaretur Petrus his verbis commodissime usus est, vos, inquit, genus electum, regale sacerdotium.*

who

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 113

who hath ° elected our Lord Jesus Christ, and us by him, to be his peculiar People, grant to every Soul, that calleth upon his glorious, holy Name, Faith, Fear, Peace, Patience, Long-suffering, Continence, Purity, and Wisdom, unto all well-pleasing of him, thro' our High-Priest, and perfect Jesus Christ, to whom be Glory, Majesty, Dominion, and Honour, now and for ever. Amen. Wherefore the Church by its Theocratical Constitution having such a Governour, to whom Glory, and Majesty, and Dominion, and Honour belongeth, that is, who is a King, as well as an High-Priest, the Government of it must be a *Kingly Priesthood*, or a *Priestly Kingdom* under his Administration, of whom it is written, *Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedeck*. So saith St. Hierom, <sup>p</sup> *Et ipse Rex & Sacerdos nobis utrumque donaverit, ut simus Genus Regale, & Sacerdotale, & quasi angularis Lapis parietem utrumque conjunxerit, & de duobus gregibus bonus pastor unum effeceret gregem*: He also, (speaking of Christ as the Antitype of Melchisedeck) being King, and Priest, gave us both (Honours) that we should be a Regal, and Sacerdotal sort (of People) and he as the Corner-stone hath united both the Walls, and as the good Shepherd of two Flocks hath made one.

But to return to the Christian Oblation, or Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, I cannot but observe, that the *Offering* of the Bread and Wine was of old esteemed so special a part of that most holy Service, that the Administration of the Holy Communion, and the Communion it self was signified by *προσφέρειν*, and *προσφέρειν* in the Greek, and by *offerre*, and *oblatio* in the Latin Church. So Can. Apost. viii. *If any Bishop or Presbyter, or Deacon, doth not receive*

---

° Πάρεξ Θεῶ ἐκλεκτον, 1 Tim. xi. 4. λίθον ἀκρογωναῖον ἐκλεκτον, *ibid.* v. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Epist. ad Evagrium, Vol. III. Edit. Basil.

# 114 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

[*ἡ εὐχαριστία ὑπομνήσκει*] at the Communion, let him give a Reason for it—but if he will not tell his Reason, let him be excommunicated, as one, who gives Offence to the People, and brings a Scandal upon [*ἡ εὐχαριστία*] upon him that administers, as if he did not rightly administer it. So Constit. Apost. Lib. viii. cap. 28. The Bishop blesseth, lays on Hands, ordains, and [*ἡ εὐχαριστία*] administers the Communion.—But the Deacon [*ἡ εὐχαριστία*] doth not administer the Communion, but [*ἡ εὐχαριστία*] but when the Bishop, or Presbyter administers the Communion, he delivers [the Cup] to the People. So Can. xviii. Concil. Nicen. The Council forbids Deacons to deliver the Eucharist to Priests, because they who have no Power [*ἡ εὐχαριστία*] to administer the Communion cannot give the Body of Christ [*τοῖς εὐχαρίστοις*] to those who minister it. It is also called *ἡ Θυσία*: And by Justin, the Martyr, *ἡ εὐχαριστία*, the Sacrifice of the [converted] Gentiles, to distinguish it from the Sacrifices of the Jews. But those who desire to see more Authorities of this sort, may consult the Citations in the Margin, and for the Authorities of single Fathers of the Greek Church, I forbear to cite them, because they are so numerous, and I have already cited enough. As for the Writers of the Latin Church, who use *oblato*, and *offerre*, for the Eucharist, and for to administer the same, it is sufficient for my purpose to send the Reader back to the Testimonies of St. Cyprian, cited in the Preface, and to his Master Tertullian, particularly to that famous Passage, which hath exercised the Pens of so many Learned Men, *Et Offers, & Tinguis, & Sacerdos es Tibi solus.* So *de cultu feminarum*, cap. ii.

\* Can. Sanct. Apost. xli.

\* Can. Concil. Niceni. xi. xiii. Can. Concil. Ancyran. xvi. Can. Concil. Neocæsar. ix, xiii. Can. Concil. Gangreni iv. Can. Concil. Laodicensi. xix. lviii.

\* De Exhort. Castit. cap. 7.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 115

*Aut imbecillus aliquis ex fratribus visitur aut Sac-  
crificium offertur, aut Dei sermo administratur.*  
So de Corona. cap. 3. *Oblationes pro defunctis, pro  
natalitiis annua die facimus,* which is to be under-  
stood of the Eucharistical Oblations, as is evident  
from the like Passage de Exhort. Castit. cap. 11. *Pro  
cujus Spiritu postulas, pro qua Oblationes reddis— &  
offerres pro duabus? Et commendabis illas duas per Sa-  
cerdotem—* Upon which place saith Rigaltius,  
*Rectè autem dicitur offerre per sacerdotem, quia solius  
sacerdotis, non vero Laicorum est, offerre sacrificium.*  
To which let me add what he saith of the Devils  
applying the Christian Sacraments and Ceremonies,  
de Prescript. Heret. cap. 40. *Diabolus res sacramen-  
torum divinorum amulatur. Tingt & ipse quosdam—  
Mithra, signat in frontibus milites suos, celebrat &  
panis oblationem.* The Devil imitates the Divine Sa-  
craments, or Mysteries, &c. he baptizes some, and  
MITHRA signs his Worshipers in their Foreheads,  
and is solemnly worshipped with an Oblation of Bread.  
Which, as I observed on the like Passage of Justin  
the Martyr, shews, that the Bread was literally of-  
fered in the Eucharist, because it was offered in the  
Sacrifices of the Idol Mithra, in imitation of the  
Christian Sacrifice. From these Testimonies, I think,  
it is plain, that the Oblation of the Elements was a  
principal Rite, or ritual part of the Eucharistical Ser-  
vice, and that from thence it came to be emphatically  
denoted by Oblation, and Sacrifice; and the Admi-  
nistration of it by προσφέρειν, and offerre in the Wri-  
ters of the ancient Greek, and Latin Church.

In the second place, I cannot but observe, that  
the ancient Church made a plain, and accurate di-  
stinction between the Oblation of Bread and Wine  
upon the Altar in the Eucharist, and the Oblation  
of other things thereupon. So in the III<sup>d</sup> Can.  
Apost. *If any Bishop, or Presbyter offers any thing up-  
on the Altar besides, what the Lord has ordained* **Et**

## 116 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

be offered] ἐν τῇ Θυσίᾳ, in the Holy Communion, he shall be deposed, excepting the First-fruits of Corn and Grapes in their proper Season. So the Council in Trullo understanding that the Ministers of some Churches used [Θυσίᾳ] at the Communion to join the Oblation of Grapes [which were only to be blessed as First-Fruits] with the unbloody Oblation, and to distribute both together to the People, they forbid any Priest to do so for the Time to come, but to deliver to the People only the Oblation for the Resurrection after Death unto Eternal Life, and the Remission of Sins. The great Council of Carthage in like manner ordained, That in the Eucharist nothing should be offered, but Bread and Wine mix'd with Water; but when the First-Fruits of Corn, or Grapes were offered, or Honey and Milk on the accustomed Day for Infants, that they should be offered by themselves upon the Altar apart, that they might be distinguish'd from the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

This distinction of the Bread, and Wine from other Altar-offerings is also expressed in the Prayer for the Communicants, *Const. Apost. Lib. viii. c. 10.* Καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰς Θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἀναρχὰς ὑποσχεσθῶμεν Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν Δεωσέμεν. Let us also pray for those, who offer Sacrifices, and First Fruits to the Lord our God. And it is a demonstration, that they were offered in the Sacrament, and that the Oblation of them was the Practice of the Catholick Church.

But Thirdly, it is evident from one Argument, which the Orthodox Fathers used in the second Council of Nice against the Worship of Images, that the Bread, and Wine were solemnly offered in the Eucharist, and that the Oblation of them was esteemed a Sacrifice of Divine Institution. That Argument was to this purpose, viz. That the Catholick

\* *Concil. Nicen. ii. Sessio Sexta. p. 458. in Labbei, & Cossartii Conciliorum, Tomo Septimo. ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΣ ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ Ἀνίστη, &c.*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 117

Church of us Christians agreed with the Jewish, and Gentile Religion, being a " Medium between both, " as having a new mystical Sacrifice instituted by God, but without the Rites, and Ceremonies of either, not admitting the bloody Sacrifices, and Burnt-offerings of Judaism, and abhorring the Idols, and Idol-worship in the Sacrifices of Gentilism, which was the Author and Inventor of that abominable Art [of making, and worshipping Idols.] For the Gentiles having no hope of a Resurrection, invented this mockery of Religion, worthy of themselves, ridiculously to represent what was not present, as present. Wherefore let us reject this foreign Invention of Men, inspired by the Devil, from the Church of Christ. From this way of reasoning against the Use of Images in Divine Worship, it is plain, that these holy Fathers thought the Christians had a Sacrifice of divine Institution, tho' not a bloody Sacrifice, as the Jews had, nor polluted with Image-Worship after the manner of the Gentiles, but a pure unbloody Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, which was a Medium of Negation from both, as being neither a bloody, nor an idololatrical Oblation.

In the fourth place, the Ancients asserted that Melchisedeck, who was the Type of Christ, offered Bread, and Wine; and that the Bread, and Wine which he offered, prefigured the Oblation of it in the Eucharist. That he offered the Bread, and Wine mentioned Gen. xiv. 18. appears from the Version of the LXXII. Καὶ Μελχισεδεκ βασιλεὺς Σαγγήμ ΕΞΗΝΕΤ-ΚΕΝ ἄζυτος καὶ οἶνον. So Tertull. adversus Judæos, Lib. i. cap. 3. Melchisedech qui ipsi Abraham jam incircumciso revertenti de pralio panem & vinum obtulit incircumciscus. And cap. 2. Unde Melchisedeck sacerdos Dei summus nuncupatus, si non ante Leviticæ

\* Ἡ καθολικὴ πίστις τῶν χειραγῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ καὶ Ἑλληνισμοῦ τυγχάνουσα.

\* Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν εὐσεβείαν δὴ Μυσταγωγίας θεοπαροδότης τείνον ὁ δίδει.

## 118 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*legis sacerdotum Levitæ fuerunt, qui sacrificia Deo offerebant.* And as they believed that *Melchisedech* first offered the Bread and Wine, with which he entertained *Abraham*: So they taught, as I have already shew'd from many Authorities, that Christ the *Antitypal Melchisedech*, as really offered Bread, and Wine to the Father at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. From those and other Authorities cited in this Letter, it is plain, that the Bread, and Wine were really offered in the Eucharist, and were in the Opinion of the ancient Church, as properly an external material Oblation in that pure unbloody Sacrifice, as any other thing could be that was offered by any Priest upon the Altar of any God.

Indeed there were \* two Oblations of the Elements in the Eucharist; one *before the Consecration*, in which they were presented to God the Father upon the Altar, as the First-Fruits of his Creatures to acknowledge him for our sovereign Lord, and Benefactor. The other *at the Consecration*, when they were offered to him as the Symbols of Christ's Body, and Blood, or as the mystical Body, and Blood of Christ, to represent that Oblation he made of both upon the Cross, and to obtain the Benefits of his Death, and Passion; who by the Oblation of himself once so offer'd, made a full, and perfect Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World. These two Oblations are distinguishable in *Justin Martyr's* short Account of the Celebration of the Eucharist: The first at the offering of the Bread, and the Cup of Water and Wine, which, saith he, the Bishop (or Priest) receiving, offers up, *ἀνθ' ἡμῶν*, Praise and Glory to God the Father of all Things, through the Name of his Son, and the Holy Spirit; and also offers

---

\* See *Irenæus*, as cited before, *Lib. iv. cap. 32.* and *Dr. Grabe's* Notes upon the place.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 119

up Thanksgiving for deeming us worthy of these his Creatures. This ' long Action of Praise and Thanksgiving may be seen at large in *Const. Apost.* Lib. viii. cap. 12. Where it begins after these Words, Ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς εἰπάτω, ἄξιον ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ δίκαιον, and ends in these, καὶ ἐκαθέσθῃ ἐκ δεξιῶν (ἐξ ἡμῶν καὶ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Then after a short Introduction, in which are the Words of the *Institution*, follows the second Oblation of the Elements, beginning at Μεμνημένοι ἐν ᾧν δι' ἡμᾶς παρέμενεν, &c. which I shall hereafter transcribe. This second Eucharistical Oblation, in which the Elements were offer'd, as the mystical Body and Blood of Christ, and wherein they pray'd God the Father graciously to accept them, is implied by *Justin* in the Word εὐχαῖς in the Sentence next to that which I have cited, viz. ὁ (ὡς ἐλεῖσάν) τὰς ΕΥΧΑΣ καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπιδύημι AMHN, which I cannot better translate than in the words of Mr. Reeves, *When the Bishop (or Priest) hath finished the Prayers, all the People present conclude with an audible Voice, saying, Amen.* These two Forms of Oblation of the Bread and Wine, tho' then in one continued Prayer, are plainly distinguish'd by *St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechis. Mystag. V.* where the first is described §. IV, V. and the latter in §. VI. and the Description of them in both places exactly agrees with the large Account of ministring the holy Sacrament in the *Apost. Const.* cited above: and they are also to be found in all the ancient Liturgies. In our present Liturgy, the first Oblation is made in the beginning of the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church, immediately after the Priest hath placed the Bread, and Wine upon the Table, in these Words, *Almighty and everlasting God— we humbly beseech thee to accept our Alms and Oblations.* And the latter is made in substance, and ac-

---

\* Καὶ εὐχαριστίαν—ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖ. *Apol. I.*, §. 86.

## 120 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

cording to the intention of the Church in the Prayer of Consecration to God the Father, where after the Commemoration of Christ's offering himself upon the Cross, and his institution of the perpetual Memorial of his precious Death, God the Father is implor'd to hear us, while, *according to the same Institution, we receive his Creatures of Bread and Wine, in remembrance of his Son our Saviour's Death and Passion*: And then while the Priest recites the Words of the Institution, he is to take the Bread into his Hands and break it; and at the Words, *This is my Body*, to lay his Hand upon all the Bread: and at the Words, *He took the Cup*, he is to take the Chalice into his Hand; and at these Words, *This is my Blood of the New Testament*, &c. he is to lay his Hand upon every Vessel, in which there is Wine to be consecrated. These are the solemn Rites which attend *our Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving*, (as it is truly call'd in the Prayer of the Post-Communion) at the Consecration, as the placing the Bread and Wine upon the Table by the Priest in order to be so consecrated by him, is also to be observed. And therefore those Bishops and Priests, who can satisfy their Consciences in the total neglect of this Rite, may as well satisfy them in the total omission of the other; and then take upon them to say, as some lately have done, *That the general Neglect of the Clergy to observe them, vacates them*; a way of arguing, which were it true, might vacate all the other Rules, and Rubricks of the Church.

But to return to the Christian Oblation, or Sacrifice; the next Argument I shall produce to prove, that the Bread and Wine were really offer'd in the holy Communion is taken from the primitive manner of the Administration of it, as set forth in the VIIIth Book of the *Apost. Constit.* cited in the last Paragraph. In this *Liturgical Account* of the holy Sacrament we read that the *Catechumens*, and *Audients*, &c. being gone out of the Church, the Dea-

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 121

con began the Office of the holy Eucharist with that general Admonition *Μή τις καλὰ τινος. Μή τις ἐν ὑποκρισὶ.* *Let none that is not in Charity, let no Hypocrite come hither.* After pronouncing these Admonitions he said, *ὁρθοὶ πρὸς κύριον μὲν φόβῳ καὶ τρέμειν* *ἐσῶτες ὡμῶς προσφῆρην.* *In sincerity towards our Lord let us standing offer with fear and trembling. Which being done* (saith the Rubrick, for so I call the Direction) *οἱ δῆκονοι προσάφετοσ' τὰ δῶρα τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον.* Let the Deacons bring the Offerings unto the Altar to the Bishop. Then the Bishop<sup>2</sup> standing in his Priestly Robes before the Altar began the Sacramental Office with this Blessing: *The Grace of Almighty God, and the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Communication of the Holy Spirit be with you all.* To which the People answer'd, *And with thy Spirit.* Then the Bishop: *Lift up your hearts;* to which the People: *We lift them up unto the Lord.* Then the Bishop: *Let us give thanks unto our Lord:* To which the People, *Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον.* *It is meet and right, &c.* Then the Bishop: *It is truly meet and right, &c.* And then after a long and noble Hymn of Praise and Glory to God the Father, and the Son, abbreviated in after-Ages, in which is the Hymn *Ter Sanctus*, and after an Introduction, in which the Words of the Institution are recited, he proceeds to the Consecration, the most special part of the sacrificial Action, beginning with the Prayer of Oblation, in the words which follow: *Μεμνημένοι τόνου καὶ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ θανάτου, καὶ τῆ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆ εἰς ἔργον ἐπανόδου, καὶ τῆ μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δόξης παρρησίας, ἐμὴ καὶ ὑμετέρα* καὶ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κόνει ζώλης καὶ νεκρῶς, καὶ ἀποδίδναι ἐκαστῷ καὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝ (οἱ τῷ βασιλεὶ καὶ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ αὐτοῦ διατάξιν, τὸ ἌΡΤΟΝ τέλειον, καὶ τὸ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ τέτοιο εὐχαριστήριον (οἱ δὲ αὐτὸ ἐφ' οἷς καθιζήσας ἡμᾶς σάνει ἐνώπιόν (ε, καὶ ἹΕΡΑΤΕΤ-

<sup>2</sup> Στάς πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου

# 122 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

EIN (οι, κ' ἀξιωματῶν (εἰ ὅπως ἐοικυῖας ἐπιθεμένης ἐπὶ  
 \* τὰ ΠΡΟΚΕΙΜΕΝΑ ΔΩΡΑ ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν (ε, (υ δ  
 ἂν ἀντιθέσης Θεός, κ' ἐοικυῖας ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν κ'  
 χρεῖς (ε, κ' καλαπήμενης τὸ ἁγίον (ε πνύμα· ἐπὶ κ'  
 ΘΥΣΙΑΝ ταύτῃ, τ' μάστιγι κ' παθημάτων κ' κυρία  
 Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ὁ ἀποφήνη τ' ΑΡΤΟΝ τῆτον ΣΩΜΑ κ'  
 χρεῖς (ε, κ' τὸ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ τῆτον ΑἶΜΑ κ' χρεῖς (ε,  
 ἵνα οἱ μετὰ λαοὶ αὐτῶν, βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσεβείαν,  
 ἀφείσας ἀμαρτημάτων τύχῃ, κ' Διαβολῆς κ' τ' πλῆ-  
 νης αὐτῶν ρυθῶσι, πνύματι ἁγίῳ πληρωθῶσιν, ἀξιοί  
 κ' χρεῖς (ε γῶν), ζῆς αἰώνις τύχῃ, (ε καλομαγέ-  
 τῶ αὐτοῖς, δέσποια πνύματι. ἐπὶ δευτέρῃ (ε, κύριε  
 κ' ὡς τ' ἁγίας (ε Ἐκκλησίας τ' ὑπὸ πειράτων ἕως πε-  
 ράτων περιεποιήσω τὴν τιμὴν ΑἶΜΑΤΙ κ' χρεῖς (ε,  
 ὅπως αὐτῶν διαφυλάξης ἄσεις κ' ἀκλυδώνισον, ἁγί-  
 (ωμῆας κ' αἰών, κ' ὡς πᾶσι ἐπισκοπῆς τ' ὁρ-  
 τομῆς τ' λόγον τ' ἀληθείας. ἐπὶ τῷ ἀποκλυσμῷ (ε  
 κ' ὡς τ' ἡμῶν κ' ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ (οι ἑσθίας,  
 κ' ὡς πᾶσι κ' πρὸς ἐλπίδα, ὡς τ' Διακόνων κ'  
 πᾶσι κ' κλήρῳ, ἵνα πᾶσι σοφίας, πνύματι ἁγίῳ  
 πληρωθῶσι. ἐπὶ τῷ ἀποκλυσμῷ (ε, κύριε, ὡς τ' ἡ βασι-  
 λείᾳ, &c. " Wherefore remembring his Passion  
 " and Death, and Resurrection from the Dead, and  
 " his Return (Ascension) into Heaven, and his se-  
 " cond Appearance, in which he will come in Glo-  
 " ry, and Power to judge the Living, and the Dead,

\* S. Cyril. Catech. Myst. cap. x. Ἐπεὶ μὲν τὸ ἐπαξιωθῆναι τὸ  
 πνύματι κ' εὐσεβείαν, τ' ἀναιμόκτον λαίλειαν ἐπὶ τ' εὐσεβείας ἐκείνης  
 κ' ἰλασμός, &c.

\* See Irenæus, Lib. IV. cap. xxxii. Sed & suis discipulis dans  
 Concilium primitias offerre ex suis creaturis non quasi indigenti.

\* Cyril. Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς ΤΑ ἍΓΙΑ τοῖς ἁγίοις,  
 ἅγια τὰ πρὸς εὐσεβείαν ἐπιφοίτησον δευτέρῃ ἁγίῳ πνύματι.

\* Ostendat sive efficiat Corpus Christ. See Isaac Casaubon, in  
 Exercit. xvi. Ad Annales Baronii. xxxiii. Ubi de Ἀναδείξει, &  
 Ἀναστάσει.

S. Cyr. ibid. Παράκλητον τ' φιλάνθρωπον διόν τὸ ἅγιον  
 πνύμα ἔκαστος εἶναι πᾶσι τὰ πρὸς εὐσεβείαν, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τ' μὴ Ἀρ-  
 τον, Σῶμα χρεῖς, τ' ὁ οἶνον, αἶμα χρεῖς.

\* Tert. Sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris, sed Deo nostro, & ipsius.  
 " and



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 123

“ and to reward every one according to their  
 “ Works: We offer this Bread, and this Cup to  
 “ thee (our) King and God, according to his In-  
 “ stitution ; giving Thanks to thee thro’ him, that  
 “ thou hast thought us worthy to stand in thy Pre-  
 “ sence, and execute the *Priest’s Office* to thee ; and  
 “ we beseech thee, that thou wouldst look with  
 “ Complacency on these *Offerings* lying before thee,  
 “ O God, who standest in need of nothing that  
 “ thou wouldst accept them for the Honour of thy  
 “ Christ, and send thy holy Spirit, the Witness

\* So in the *Æthiopick Liturgy*, as translated by Ludolf, *ad suam Hist. Æthiopicam Commentar.* p. 325. *Recordantes igitur mortis ejus, & Resurrectionis ejus, offerimus tibi hunc panem, & calicem gratias agentes tibi, quod nos reddidisti dignos ut stemus coram te, & Sacerdotio tibi fungamur. Suppliciter oramus te, ut mittas Spiritum tuum Sanctum super oblationes hujus Ecclesiæ, pariterque largiaris omnibus, qui sumunt de iis, ut prosit eis ad Sanctitatem ; ut repleantur Spiritu Sancto, &c.*

This is the Form of Consecration in their general Liturgy; but besides that they have particular Lieurgies to be used on particular Days, one of which is entituled, *Oratio Eucharistica Domini, & Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi*, not that they pretend it was made by our Lord, but that it is used on those special Holy-days, in which his Nativity, Resurrection, and Ascension were celebrated. In this Administration, the Consecration is as follows:

\* *Nunc igitur, O Domine! memores sumus Mortis,* \* *Ibid.* p. 343.  
 & *Resurrectionis tuæ, confidimus tibi, & OFFE-* 344.

*RIMUS tibi panem, & calicem, Gratias agentes tibi ; tibi soli, quia à seculo es Salvator Deus. Quoniam tu jussisti nos, ut stemus coram te, & tibi instar Sacerdotum ministremus, propter hoc nos quoque servi tui rogamus te, Domine, & supplicamus tibi, ut mittas Spiritum Sanctum, & Virtutem super hunc panem, & super hunc calicem, ut efficiat Corpus, & Sanguinem Domini, & Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi in secula seculorum. Porro offerimus tibi hanc gratiarum actionem, O æterna Trinitas ! Domine Pater Jesu Christi, quem omnis creatura & anima veneratur.* This Office was undoubtedly made after the first general Council of Nice to the Honour of Christ as God, equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and therefore the Oblation is made unto him.

<sup>f</sup> *Heb. ix. 14.* How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offer’d up himself, &c.

“ of

## 124 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

“ of the Sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ upon  
 “ this *Sacrifice*,<sup>s</sup> that he may (*make*) shew forth  
 “ this Bread to be the Body of thy Christ, and this  
 “ Cup to be thy Christ’s Blood, that the Partakers  
 “ thereof may be confirm’d in Godliness; obtain  
 “ the Remission of their Sins; be deliver’d from  
 “ the Devil, and his Wiles; be fill’d with the Holy  
 “ Ghost; made worthy of thy Christ; (*and*) ob-  
 “ tain eternal Life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, be-  
 “ ing reconcil’d to them. Farthermore we pray  
 “ unto thee for thy holy Church dispers’d from one  
 “ end of the World to the other, which thou hast  
 “ purchas’d with the precious Blood of thy Christ,  
 “ that thou wouldst preserve it unshaken, and un-  
 “ molested to the end of the World. (*We pray*)  
 “ likewise for the whole Episcopate rightly divi-  
 “ ding the Word of Truth. We pray also for my  
 “ worthless self, who am making this *Oblation*,  
 “ and for all the Presbyters, for the Deacons, and  
 “ the Clergy, that thou wouldst instruct them, and  
 “ fill them with the Holy Spirit. Farthermore, O  
 “ Lord, we offer unto thee for the Emperor, &c.

This is as plain a Description of a Sacrifice, and a sacrificial Action, as is in any Author sacred or prophane; and *mutatis mutandis* may be said of any Sacrifice offer’d upon any Altar, or to any God. And we find the Bishop in the XIII<sup>th</sup> Chapter saying: *Let us also pray unto God thro’ his Christ for the*<sup>h</sup> *Offering, which has been offer’d to the Lord God, that our merciful God through the Mediation of his Christ would receive it up unto his holy heavenly Altar for a sweet smelling savour.* In the same Chapter the Rubrick calls the consecrated Bread to be distributed,<sup>i</sup> *the Offering.* Answerably to all which in

<sup>s</sup> *Alias*, that IT, if understood of the Sacrifice.

<sup>h</sup> Ὡς τὸ Δῶρε τὸ προσκομιδένον.

<sup>i</sup> Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπισκοπὴ διδόντω τὸ προσφορὸν.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 125

the 57<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the 2<sup>d</sup> Book, in a short Account of the manner of administering the holy Sacrament, the Administration of it is call'd <sup>k</sup> the Oblation of the Eucharist. Let some of the Deacons attend to the Oblation of the Eucharist, ministering to the Body of the Lord with fear, and let others look after the Congregation, and enjoin them silence. Then let the Deacon, who assists the Bishop, say, Let none come here, who hath injur'd another; let no Hypocrite come hither. Then let the Men mutually salute the Men, and the Women, the Women with the holy Kiss. But let none salute another treacherously, as Judas did, who betray'd our Lord with a Kiss. After this let the Deacon pray for the universal Church, &c. Then let the Bishop, having given the Peace of God to the People, bless them as Moses commanded the Priests, and praying, say: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee — After this let <sup>l</sup> the Sacrifice be done (offered) all the People standing and praying in silence; and when it is <sup>m</sup> offered up, let every Order by it self orderly partake of the Lord's Body, and precious Blood with Reverence and Fear.

This Account of the Eucharistical Service is, as I have before observed, most agreeable to the Accounts we have of it, and of the Administration thereof both in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, and also to the Doctrine of it in his Dialogue with Trypho, and I do not doubt, but it is most conformable to the Primitive, and Apostolical Form. And now let any candid Reader judge, whether the Bread, and Wine are not [the ΔΩΠΑ] Offerings, in a proper literal sense, which were brought by the Deacons to the Altar unto the Bishop, that he might place them on the Holy Table to be consecrated in the Service of the holy Eucharist; the [ΤΙΠΟΚΕΙΜΕΝΑ ΔΩΠΑ] proper material Offerings,

<sup>k</sup> Οἱ μὲν τῇ προσφορά τῆς εὐχαριστίας χολαζέτωσθαι.

<sup>l</sup> Μετὰ τὸ ταῦτα ᾄδω ἡ δὲ σὺν. <sup>m</sup> Καὶ ὅταν ἀνέχῃσθαι.

that

## 126 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

that lay upon the Altar, and upon which the *Bishop* pray'd God to look down in Mercy; the *Offerings*, of which the <sup>a</sup> *Bishop*, or Priest only was the *Offerer*; the *Offerings*, which he took in his Hands, and offer'd in <sup>o</sup> the Name of the People; the *Offerings*, of which God has no need, the *Offerings*, or the [ΘΥΣΙΑΝ] *Sacrifice*, upon which he prays God to send down his Holy Spirit, that it might shew forth the Bread to be the Body, and the Cup, the Blood to the Receivers: Lastly the *Offerings* of which the Oblation, and Consecration was call'd the *Sacrifice*, and of which they said in the ancient Offices, *Sancta sanctis, & tibi ex his offerimus*. And if all this be true, then let the Reader also judge, whether the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist was not a *sacrificial Action*, or Administration, and the *Bread and Wine*, the materials of that Sacrifice, which were first presented, and then by solemn Consecration offer'd up unto God, and last of all distributed to the Faithful <sup>p</sup> for the Favour of God, the Remission of their Sins, the Benefit both of their Bodies and Souls, the Confirmation and Increase of their Faith, and preserving of them in all Godliness, and unto the Life of the World to come. In a word it is evident, that according to the ancient Church the *Bread and Wine* were the matter, which the People brought, and the *Bishop* receiv'd, to be spent, or consumed in the Celebration of the Eucharist; the *Matter* which the *Bishop* solemnly offer'd up to God by Consecration for the heavenly Banquet of the Lord's Supper, and which as they were in the literal sense a proper, external, material *Offering*, or *Sacrifice*, which succeeded in the place of the legal Sacrifices: so in the *sacramental*, or *mystical*, they were the Body, and Blood of Christ, of which they were the Represen-

<sup>a</sup> Ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ ἱερείας.

<sup>o</sup> Προσφερόμενόν Κοι. <sup>p</sup> Constit. Apost. Lib. viii. cap. 14, 15.  
tatives,



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 127

tatives, and whereof the one was broken with Wounds, and the other shed upon the Cross. To this Liturgical Testimony in the *Apost. Const.* I shall, as I promised in <sup>a</sup> another place, produce the Testimonies of the ancient Liturgies, which suppose the Eucharist to be a *Sacrifice*, in which the Bread, and Wine were solemnly offered in a proper literal sense by Prayer, and Thanksgiving to God.

I begin with the Liturgy of *St. Chrysostom*, of which there are two Editions, one in the <sup>r</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> Vol. of his Works, the other by *Goar* in his *Euchologion*, both which begin with this secret Prayer of the Priests in the beginning of the ministration, *Send down, O Lord, thy <sup>r</sup> Assistance from thy holy Habitation, and strengthen me in thy Service, which I am going to perform, that I may stand without blame before thy tremendous Altar, and minister the unbloody Sacrifice, &c.* So in the Prayer at the *wegdeois*, or Table, where the Peoples Oblations of Bread, and Wine were set, before they were brought to the Altar, of thy Goodness, and Love for Mankind, remember those, who have offered, and those for whom they have offered. So in the Prayer for the Communicants: O Lord the God of Powers, we give Thanks to thee, who hast deemed us worthy to appear at thy Altar to supplicate thy Mercy for our Sins, and the Errors of thy People: O God receive our Prayer, and make us worthy to offer up to thee Prayers, and Supplications, and unbloody Sacrifices for all thy People, &c. So in the *Cherubick Hymn*, or Prayer—who out of thy ineffable, and immense Love of Mankind wast made Man not by Conversion, or Confusion [of Substance], and hast been declared our High-Priest by God, and

<sup>a</sup> Preface to a second Collection of controversial Letters, &c. Printed for Rich. Save at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1710.

<sup>r</sup> Parisiis M. DC. XXXVI.

<sup>r</sup> Lutetiz Parisiorum. M. DC. XLVII.

<sup>r</sup> Tla' xēgēd. Co.

## 128 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

as Lord of all hast instituted the Ministration of this unbloody Sacrifice, &c. — to thee do I come, — and beseech thee not to turn thy Face from me, nor to reject me from among thy Children, but graciously permit, that these Gifts may be offered up by me a Sinner. So in the Prayer after the Oblations are placed upon the Altar : O Lord God Almighty, who only art holy, and who receivest the Sacrifice of Praise from those, who call upon thee with their whole Heart, receive the Prayer of us Sinners, and bring it to thy holy Altar, and make us worthy to offer up these Gifts, and spiritual Sacrifices for our Sins, " and the Errors of the People, and grant we may find Grace in thy sight to have this our Sacrifice made acceptable to thee. Then after the *Sursum Corda*, and the Prayer of Thanksgiving, mentioned by Justin Martyr, and the Words of the Institution, the Priest saith, as in the Consecration before cited out of the *Apost. Const.* Wherefore remembering this salutary Commandment, and all the things that are done for us : his Death, Burial, Resurrection on the third Day, his Ascension into Heaven, his sitting at thy right Hand, and his second, and glorious Coming, we offer thy own [Gifts, or Creatures] unto thee — We also offer up unto thee this reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifice, and we pray, and beseech thee to send down thy holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts. AMEN.

Make this Bread the precious [mystical Body] of thy Christ, AMEN. And what is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing [them] by thy Holy Spirit. Then in a Prayer after the Lord's Prayer, Thou therefore, O Lord, bless " these Gifts which are set before thee to us all, according to every ones Necessity, &c.

So in the Liturgy of St. Basil, in the Prayer at the *Prothesis*, upon which the Oblations were set :

" Heb. ix. 7.

" Τὰ ἁγνεύματα Δωρεῶν.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 129

<sup>x</sup> Bless this Table, and the Oblations thereupon, and receive them up unto thy Altar in the highest Heavens; and of thy Goodness and Love towards Men remember the Offerers, and those for whom they have offered, and preserve us free from all Sin in the administration of these holy Mysteries, &c. So in the Prayer of the Priest after the offerings are set on the Holy Table, or Altar: May it please thee, O Lord, as we are <sup>1</sup> Ministers of the New Testament, and <sup>2</sup> Liturgs of thy holy <sup>3</sup> Mysteries, according to the multitude of thy Mercies, to receive us who are approaching to thy holy Altar, that we may be worthy to offer unto thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice for our Sins, and the Errors of the People. Which thou having received up for a sweet Savour to thy holy and intellectual Altar, send down <sup>b</sup> for it the Grace of thy Holy Spirit upon us. Look upon us, O Lord; and upon this our <sup>c</sup> Sacrifice, and receive it, as thou didst receive the Oblations of Abel; the Sacrifices of Noah; the Holocausts of Abraham; the Consecration-offerings of Moses, and Aaron; the Peace Offerings of Samuel, even as thou didst receive this Eucharistical Oblation, the <sup>d</sup> verity of them, from thy holy Apostles; let us stand as becomes us

<sup>x</sup> Εὐλόησον ὃ προσέσει τῷ τῷ.

<sup>y</sup> Διακόνους. <sup>z</sup> Λειτουργίες.

<sup>a</sup> Or Sacraments. Meaning the Sacrament or Mystery of the Bread, and the Sacrament of the Cup: For so the Ancients used to speak of the Holy Eucharist, as of one Sacrament or Mystery, made up of two. So Gregory the Great called his Eucharistical Office, *Liber Sacramentorum*. See the Benedictines Note on the Title of the Book, and Menardus's Note on the same. See also Suicerus in *Μυστήριον*. *Sacra cœna vocatur μυστήριον, πληθυντικῶς, pluraliter, &c.*

<sup>b</sup> Ἀντικατάστατον ἡμῖν ὃ χεῖν.

<sup>c</sup> Λαλῆσαι: Which Word in the Eucharistical Offices, is used in the most strict sense for the Celebration of the Eucharistical or Christian Sacrifice. See Suicer's *Thesaurus*, in the Word *λαλῆσαι*.

<sup>d</sup> Τῷ Ἀληθινῷ τῷ τῷ λαλῆσαι.

with

### 130 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

with Reverence, and take heed that we offer this  
<sup>f</sup> holy Offering in Peace.

Wherefore most holy Lord—we approach to thy  
 holy Altar, and having set [thereupon] the Figures  
 [or Symbols] of the holy Body, and Blood of thy  
 Christ, we pray, and beseech thee, O most holy,  
 by the pleasure of thy Goodness, that thy Holy Spirit  
 may come upon us, and upon these Gifts lying before  
 thee, to bless them, and sanctify them, and <sup>f</sup> make  
 them the Body and Blood of Christ.

Thou, O our God, who hast received these Gifts,  
 cleanse us from all filthiness of Flesh and Spirit, &c.

I could add more such Passages out of this Eucharis-  
 tical Office, but because they are the same with those  
 in that of St. Chrysostom, or almost the same, I  
 thought fit to pass over them, and proceed to the  
 other Greek Liturgies, as I find them in ii. Tom.  
*Biblioth. Patrum veterum*, publish'd at Paris  
 M.DC.XXIV. I shall begin with the Liturgy of  
 St. James, i. e. of the Church of <sup>s</sup> Jerusalem, of  
 which he was the first Bishop. There in the begin-  
 ning of the sacramental Office the Priest prays,  
 Ἀγαθὰ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, &c. O Lord Jesu Christ—  
 purge us from all Sin, and grant that we may present  
 our selves pure before thy Altar, that we may offer  
 unto thee the Sacrifice of Praise, &c. Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πᾶσι  
 κρείττον, &c. O Almighty God, who gives us access to the  
 Holy of Holies—fearing, and trembling to approach  
 thy holy Altar we implore thy Goodness: Send down thy  
 Grace upon us, and sanctify our Souls, Bodies, and  
 Spirits—that we may offer these <sup>h</sup> Gifts, Presents,

<sup>a</sup> Τὸν ἁγίον ἀναφορῶν.

<sup>f</sup> Ἀναδ' ἑα.

<sup>g</sup> This Liturgy corrupted as we have it, agrees in many things  
 with what Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, mentions *Catech. v. My-*  
*stagog.*

<sup>h</sup> Δῶρα, δῶματα, κατὰ μυστήρια. In the Missale of Gregory the  
 Great, Dona, munera, sacrificia.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 131

and Sacrifices with a pure Conscience, &c. Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκείνῳ τὰ ἅγια δῶρα, &c. The Priest who brings in the holy Gifts shall say this Prayer. Ὁ ἐμὸν ἑαυτοῦ, &c. O Lord, who hast visited us in Mercy and Pity, and given us poor Sinners, and thine unworthy Servants leave to come unto thy holy Altar, and offer<sup>i</sup> this tremendous, and unbloody Sacrifice for our Sins, &c.— And of thy Goodness receive me, who approach thy holy Altar; and grant that these Gifts offered by my Hands may be made acceptable to thee, &c. Καὶ τὰ ὄψιμα μῆλα τῇ ἱερᾷ τωτῇ τελεσῇ, &c. And uncovering the secret meaning, which is symbolically veiled in this holy Sacrifice, shew it clearly to us, &c. And then in the Prayer of Consecration, Μεμνημένοι σου, &c. We Sinners therefore being mindful of his Sufferings, offer unto thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice; Have Mercy upon us, O Lord, and send down thy most holy Spirit upon these Gifts which are set before thee—that descending upon them he may by his holy, gracious, and glorious Presence, make this Bread the holy Body of Christ, and this Cup his precious Blood. Ὑπὲρ τῆς προσκομιδῆς σου, &c. Let us pray unto God for these sanctify'd, precious, heavenly, ineffable, pure, glorious, tremendous, dreadful, and divine Oblations, that our Lord would receive them into his holy, heavenly, intellectual, and spiritual Altar, for a sweet smelling savour, &c. Ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου, &c. O God the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast received the Gifts, Presents, and Sacrifices offered unto thee for a sweet smelling savour, and hast vouchsafed to sanctify, and consecrate them by the Grace of thy Christ, and the Descent of thy most holy Spirit: O sanctify also our Souls, Bodies, and Spirits, &c.

So in the Liturgy of St. Mark, or the Church of Alexandria, at the beginning of the Oblation: O Lord our God, who art our Sovereign Lord — who hast

---

<sup>i</sup> Τὴν προσκομὴν τῶν τῶν καὶ ἀναμνηστικῶν θυσιῶν.

## 132 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

made all things by thy Wisdom, the true Light, thy only begotten Son, our Lord, and God, and only Saviour Jesus Christ, through whom giving Thanks to thee, and with thy holy Spirit, we offer this reasonable, and unbloody Sacrifice, which all Nations offer up unto thee from the rising of the Sun unto the setting thereof; from the North to the South, \* because great is thy Name among all People, and Incense, and Sacrifice, and Oblation is offered unto thee in every place. Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν ἀρετὰ, &c. And grant that we may have our part and lot with all thy Saints, who bring unto thee † sacrificial Oblations. And, O God, receive up these Eucharistical ‡ Gifts into thy heavenly, and intellectual Altar. Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, τὰ Σὰ ἐκ τῆ Σῶν Δαίμων, &c. O Lord our God, we have set what are thine of thy own Gifts before thee; and we pray, and beseech thee, O bountiful lover of Mankind, to send down from the height of thy holy Place, from thy † prepared Tabernacle, from thy infinite Bosomes [of Love] the Paraclete himself, the Spirit of Truth, the holy, ° quickning Lord, who spake in the Law, and the Prophets, and Apostles, who is every where present, and fills all things, and † worketh not ministerially, but by his own Power Holiness according to thy good Pleasure, in whom he will; who is simple by Nature, but manifold in his Operations; who is the Fountain of divine Gifts and Graces, consubstantial to thee, and proceeding from thee, and sits with thee, and thy only begotten Son, and our Lord, and God, and Saviour Jesus Christ in the Throne of thy Kingdom: O send down this holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Loaves, and these Cups; that as God omnipotent he may sanctify, and consecrate them, and make this Bread

\* These Words allude to Malachi i. 10, 11.

† τὴν θυσίαν τὰς προσφορὰς.

‡ τὰ εὐχαριστήρια.

§ ἵ ἐτοιμὰ καὶ σκευὰς σου, ἐν τῇ ἀπεισέσθῃ σου καὶ ἡμῶν σου.

¶ ὡς ποιεῖς.

§ Ἐνεργεῖτε αὐτεξουσίαν, & διακονίαν.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 133

the Body, and the Cup the Blood of the New Testament of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King of Kings Jesus Christ.

So in the Liturgy of St. Peter, that is, of the Latin Liturgy of the Church of Rome, translated into Greek, *Θυσίαν κύριε Σοι*, &c. O Lord, sanctify this Sacrifice, which is to be offered to thee, and receive us graciously, &c. *Σὲ τοίνυν*, &c. We therefore pray, and beseech thee, most merciful Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wouldst please to accept, and bless these <sup>9</sup> Gifts, this Oblation, this holy, and pure Sacrifice which we offer up to thee in the first place for thy holy Catholick Apostolical Church. *Ταύτῳ τοίνυν ἡ προσφορά*, &c. O Lord, we beseech thee mercifully to receive this Offering of our [bounden Duty and] Service which we offer to thee — which we beseech thee, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to make <sup>10</sup> blessed, (*Ἀπεισέγραπτον*) amiable, grateful, and acceptable, that it may be unto us the Body, and Blood of thy beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord. — *Τὰ Σὰ ἐκ τῶν προσφεγμένων*, &c. Thy own of thy own; this pure Sacrifice, this holy Sacrifice, this spotless Sacrifice, this holy Bread of eternal Life, and Cup of everlasting Salvation we offer of thy Gifts, and Benefits unto thee, upon which we beseech thee that thou wouldst

<sup>9</sup> Ταῦτα τὰ δῶρα, ταύτῳ ἡ προσφορά, ταύτῳ ἡ ἀγία θυσία ἡ ἀμώμῃς in the Roman Missal. *Hæc Dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata.*

<sup>10</sup> Δεόμεθα κυλοσινώμεν, ΑΠΕΙΤΓΡΑΠΤΟΝ, Ἐξέσμιον, Ἐυαγορόσηον, προσδεχσάμεν τε ποιῆσαι καὶ αἰξιώνως. In St. Gregory's sacramentary: *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quasumus benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris.* All which terms are explained by Menardus, Not. 46, 47, 48, 49. The Greek translator did not rightly understand the Latin terms, and therefore he absurdly rendred *adscriptam* by *ἀπεισέγραπτον*, which in the Theological Sense always signifies, incomprehensible, unconceptivable. As in Hesychius, Phavorinus, Suicer. Steph. Thesaur. In *Liturgia quæ S. Petri esse creditur*, non ita rectè legitur *Ἀπεισέγραπτον*, id est *incircumscripam, incomprehensibilem*. Hesych. *Ἀπεισέγραπτον. Ἀπεινώμενον.* Menard. in Not. 47.

## 134 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

look with a propitious and serene Countenance, and to accept as thou wast pleas'd to accept the Gifts of thy righteous Child Abel—And command that it be carried up by the Hand of thy ministring Angel unto thy Altar above, before thy divine Majesty; that whosoever of us shall receive any holy part of the Body of thy Son, or of his Blood, may be filled with thy heavenly Benediction, and Grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

So in the Lent-Office of administering the Eucharist, *ex præsantificationis*, translated by Genebrard. Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσεθέντων καὶ, προσελαδένων τιμίων Δωρῶν καὶ κυρίως δ' ἐνθώμῳ, Let us pray for the precious Gifts, or Oblations, which have before been presented, and sanctified. Ὁ τ' ἀρρήτων, &c. O God of ineffable, and invisible Mysteries, with whom are hid the Treasures of Wisdom, and Knowledge—and who of thy great Love towards Men, hast appointed us Sinners to offer Gifts, and Sacrifices for our own Sins, &c.

I might, Sir, from the Greek Liturgies as now extant, return to the ancient Greek Writers, and cite many more Authorities out of them for the Eucharistical Oblation, especially that ' in the  
Margin,

---

' In the Prayer of Consecration of a Bishop *Apost. Const. Lib. viii. cap. 5.* Δὸς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι σου, καρδιωσώσας θεέ, ἐπὶ τῷ δέσλῳ σου τόνδε, ὃν ἔχῃς εἰς ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΝ, ποιμαίνειν καὶ ἀγίαν σου ποίμνην, καὶ Ἀρχιερεῖς δύναι σοι, ἀμέμπως λειτεργεῖν ἀνυκτὸς, καὶ ἡμέρας, καὶ ἔξιλασκόμενόν σου προσωπον, ὑποσώμασθαι καὶ τῷ Ἀειθρῶν τῷ Σωζομένῳ, καὶ προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς Ἀγίας σου Εκκλησίας. Δὸς αὐτῷ, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου τῶν Μέλυσαν τῶν Ἀγίων πανάμαρτον, ὅς σε ἔχον ἔξοσίαν ἀρῆναι ἀμάρτίας καὶ τῶν ἐν ὀλῇ σου· διδόναι κλήρος καὶ τὸ πρὸς αἵμα σου, λύειν τὸ πάντα συνδέσμον καὶ τῶν ἑκείνων ἢ ἐδωκας τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις· ἐναυεῖν δέ σοι ἐν παρόντι, καὶ καθαρὰ καρδίᾳ ἀτρέπτως, ἀμέμπως, ἀνεκλήτως προσφέρουσά σοι καθαρὰ καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, ἢ διὰ χειρῶν διδίδω, τὸ Μυστήριον τῆς καυῆς Διαθήκης· εἰς ὁμὴν ἐναυδίας διὰ τῶν Ἀγίων πατέρων σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι' ἃ σοι Δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ δόξα, ἐν ἀγίῳ πανάμαρτον νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τὸν Αἰῶνα τῶν Αἰώνων. O God who knowest the Heart, give for thy own Name to this thy Servant, whom thou



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 135

Margin, to which I refer my Reader, but from the Liturgies of the Greek Churches, it is time to lead you to those of the Latin, among whom I shall begin

thou hast chosen to be a Bishop, Grace to feed thy holy Flock, and to execute before thee the Office of an High-Priest ministring by night, and by day unblameably, to make atonement before thee, (and) to assemble the number of those, who are saved, and to offer the Gifts of thy holy Church. Give him, O Lord Almighty, through thy Christ, the Communication of the Holy Ghost, that he may have Power to remit Sins according to thy Command; to give holy Orders; to loose every Bond according to the Power thou gavest to thy Apostles; to please thee in all Meekness, and with a clean heart to offer unto thee constantly, unblameably, and without fault the pure, and unbloody Sacrifice, which thou hast ordained by Christ to be the Sacrament of the New Testament for a sweet savour through thy holy Child Jesus Christ our God, and Saviour, through whom in the Holy Spirit be unto thee Glory, Honour, and Worship now, and always, and for ever, and ever. In the Commentary of Jobus Ludolphus ad suam Hist. Æthiopicam, p. 324. this Passage is rendered, as follows: Da, O gnare cordium pater, ut servus tuus, quem elegisti ad Episcopatum, pascat Gregem tuum, & Sacerdotio fungatur coram te absque reprehensione, ut ministrans noctu diuque suppliciter oret, videatque faciem tuam, ut digne offerat oblationem sanctæ Ecclesiæ tuæ, & in Spiritu Sacerdotii sancto habens facultatem remittendi peccata secundum mandatum tuum, & dandi ordines secundum institutionem tuam, atque solvendi omne vinculum iniquitatis secundum potestatem, quam dedisti Apostolis tuis, ut acceptus tibi sit in sinceritate, & puro corde offerendo tibi Odorem suavem, per filium tuum Jesum Christum, in quo tibi sit laus & potentia: Gloria Patri, & Filio, & Spiritui Sancto in sancta Ecclesia nunc & semper, & in secula seculorum. Amen.

In the Barocclian MS at Oxford 26 fol. 151. b. entitled Διατάξεις τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιῶν, διὰ Ἱππολύτου. The same Passage is to be read in these Words: καὶ νῦν ἐπιχρεῖ τῷ ᾧ δὲ ὡς Δυνάμει τῇ ἡγεμονικῇ πανδραμῆ, ὅπως διὰ τὴν ἡγαπῶμεν ὡς πατέρα τὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸν δεδωρησάμενος τοῖς ἁγίοις ὡς Ἀποστόλοις, οἱ καθ' ἑαυτὸν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ τὸν πόνον ἀσίσματος ὡς [εἰς δόξαν καὶ αἶνον ἈΔΙΑΛΕΙΠΤΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΣΟΥ] καρδιωσύνῳσιν πάντων, ἐπὶ τῷ δέῳ ὡς πᾶσι, ὃν ἐκλήρω εἰς Ἐπισκοπὴν ὡς τῇ ἁγίᾳ, καὶ Ἀρχιερασίᾳ σου ἀμέμπως λειτουργήσας νυκτὸς ἡμέρας, ἀδιάλειπτος τε ἰλασκέων τὸ πρῶτον ὡς, καὶ προσφέρει σοὶ τὰ δῶρα τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὡς Ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τὰ πανδραμῆ τῷ Ἀρχιερατικῷ ἔχειν ἡσυχίαν ἀφίνα ἀμύλην καὶ τῇ ἐντολῇ ὡς· δίδόναι κλήρος καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ὡς.

## 136 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

begin with the *Sacramentary* of *Gregory the Great*, where the Canon of the *Mass* (for *Mass* of old, as well as *Pope*, was a word of good, and harmless signification

Ὁ, λύνει τε πάντα δαίμονας καὶ ἡ ἁγία ἡν δέδωκας τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, εὐαρισεῖν τε ἡμεῖς ἐν παρόντι καὶ καθαῖα καρδίᾳ προσφέρειν ἡμεῖς ὁσὴν εὐχαρίαν διὰ τοῦ παιδὸς ἡμοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατεῖς ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς, τὴν ἡμεῖς ἀγίῳ πνεύματι νῦν καὶ ἀεί, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν.

Though there is a verbal difference between these two Greek Copies of the ancient *Prayer of Consecration*, and of the *Abyssen-Aethiopick* Version from them both: Yet as to Sense and Substance they are really the same. And the difference of Words, and Expressions, and of the Order of them shews, that what they all agree in must be genuine, and true; and particularly, that the Holy Eucharist is, and was anciently esteemed to be the *Sacrifice of the Christian Church*. I must also advertise my Reader, that the words in the *Baroccian* Copy included within the Hooks, though they are written in the same Hand, and same Ink with the rest of the Manuscript, yet they have *Points* made overagainst them at the left hand in the Margin: Which seems to denote, that the *Copist*, who so distinguishes them, suspected them not to be genuine, but inserted from the Margin of some Copy, or some other place. The like sacrificial Phrase for the Eucharist as ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙΝ ΔΩΠΑ, used by *St. Clement* in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, and in this *Prayer of Consecration*, is also used by *Greg. Nazianz.* in his Oration at the Consecration of *Eulalius* Bishop of *Doara* in *Capadocia*, O Son of *Dathan* and *Abiram* (saith he in an Apostrophe to some factious Bishop) who durst rise up against *Moses*, and laid thy Hands upon us, as they did their Tongues upon him, the great Servant of God. How hadst thou no Horror? Wast thou not confounded? And did not thy Countenance fall to the Ground, when thou thoughtest of these things? Durst thou after this hold up these Hands to God? Εἰς ΔΩΠΑ ΠΡΟΣΑΞΕΙΣ; Durst thou after this offer the Gifts? Durst thou after this pray for the People? With this ancient Consecration-Prayer agree those in the modern Greek Rituals, as may be seen in *Goar's Euchologium*, p. 302, 303. and *Habertus's*, *Lib. Pontif. Ecclesia Græca*. p. 317, 318. Δέωσθαι κύριε, &c. O Lord our God, who by thy glorious Apostle *St. Paul*, hast given a Rule for Degrees and Orders to serve in the Ministration of thy venerable, and immaculate Mysteries of thy Holy Altar: as first Apostles, &c. So κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, &c. O Lord our God, who because the nature of Man cannot bear thy divine Presence, hast by thy Oeconomy appointed Doctors of like Infirmities with us [καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς Θεσπύροις] to sit on thy Throne, and to offer up

unto

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 137

nification) begins with this Prayer: *Wherefore, O most merciful Father, we humbly pray, and beseech thee through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, that thou wouldst accept, and bless these Gifts, these Presents, these holy pure Sacrifices, which we offer up to thee for thy Holy Catholick Church—Wherefore we beseech thee that thou wouldst graciously receive this Oblation of our Service, and of thy whole Family—Which Oblation, we beseech thee that it may please thee to make blessed, appropriated, approved, rational, and acceptable, that it may be unto us the Body, and Blood of thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.* In the Treatise *de Sacramentis*, falsely ascribed to St. Ambrose, but written by some orthodox Author of the ninth Century: the Words of this Prayer are these which follow, *Vis scire quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur? Accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos: fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod sit in figuram corporis, & sanguinis Do-*

unto thee [*Ἰδοὺ τὸ ἑσθλα*] a Sacrifice, and Oblation for all thy People: Do thou, O Lord, make this elected Steward of the Episcopal Grace a Follower of thy true Shepherd, in laying down his Life for thy Sheep; a Guide to the Blind; a Light to those who live in Darkness; a Preceptor of the Ignorant; a Teacher of Babes; a Luminary to the World, that when he hath reformed the Souls committed to his Charge in this Life, he may without shame present himself before thy Tribunal, and receive the great Reward, which thou hast prepared for those Champions, who endure much contention in preaching the Gospel.

<sup>1</sup> *Hæc dona. Hæc munera. Hæc sancta sacrificia illibata.* Menard. in locum. *Dona sunt, quæ voluntariè donantur: Munera sunt, quæ pro aliquo munere, vel mercede offeruntur, sicut nos offerimus Deo, ut peccata nostra dimittantur: sacrificio sunt, quæ cum rationibus consecrantur.*

<sup>2</sup> *Quam oblationem, quesumus, Benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis corpus, &c.*

<sup>3</sup> Lib. iv. cap. 5.

<sup>4</sup> This seems to shew, that the Author lived in the Time of the Controversy between Paschasius Radbertus and Bertramus. The former of whom, as Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. confesses, was the first, qui serio & copiose scripsit de veritate, corporis, & sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia.

## 138 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*mini nostri Jesu Christi.* In this Prayer to God to appropriate, ratify, and accept the Elements to be offered, and thereby to become the figurative or mystical Body and Blood of Christ, the Words *Benedictam*, and *ratam* are omitted; but in the present Canon of the Roman Mass they are as in the Sacramentary of Gregory I. Wherefore, O Lord, we thy Servants, and thy holy People being mindful of thy Son our God, and of his blessed Passion, also of his Resurrection from the Dead, and his glorious Ascension into Heaven, offer unto thy glorious Majesty a pure, holy, and spotless<sup>b</sup> Sacrifice<sup>c</sup> of thy own Gifts, and Benefits, the holy Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup of Everlasting Salvation. Upon which we beseech thee look with a propitious and serene Countenance, and vouchsafe to accept them, as thou didst receive the Oblations of thy righteous Servant Abel, and the Sacrifice of our Patriarch Abraham, and the holy Sacrifice that immaculate Host which Melchisedech thy High-Priest offered to thee. And we humbly beseech thee, Almighty God, command that<sup>d</sup> these [Oblations] be carried up by the Hands of Angels unto thy heavenly Altar in thy sight; that as many of us, as have partaked of the Body, and Blood of thy Son at this Altar, may be filled with thy Benediction, and Grace, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

So in the *Codices Sacramentorum*, published at Rome by Joseph Maria Thomasius, M.DC.LXXX. which are ancient Offices written about the latter end of the eighth Century; in which omitting all the Prayers of the Priest, I shall only cite the Words in the<sup>e</sup> Canon of the Celebration of the Eucharist; where after *Sursum Corda*, &c. Lift up your Hearts.

<sup>b</sup> *Hostiam puram, Hostiam sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam.*

<sup>c</sup> *De tuis donis, ac Datis.* See Menardus on the place.

<sup>d</sup> *Jube hæc perferri*, viz. The Bread and Wine, which therefore could not be the very Body, and Blood of Christ, who is always in Heaven.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iii. p. 196.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 139

R. *We lift them up unto the Lord. Let us give Thanks unto our Lord God.* R. *It is meet and right so to do.* Then it follows, *Et justum est, æquum, & salutare, &c.* *It is meet, right, and for our Comfort, that we should always, and in all places give Thanks unto thee O Lord, holy Father Almighty, and eternal God, &c.* *Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum filium tuum, &c.* *We therefore, most merciful Father, humbly pray, and beseech thee through Jesus Christ thy Son, our Lord: Uti accepta habeas, & benedicas hæc Dona, hæc Munera, hæc Sancta Sacrificia illibata, &c.* *That thou wouldst accept, and bless these Oblations, these Gifts, these holy unspotted Sacrifices, which in the first place we offer unto thee for thy Holy Catholick Church, &c.* *Hanc igitur Oblationem servitutis nostræ, &c.* *We therefore pray thee, O Lord, that it may please thee to accept this Oblation of our bounden Duty and Service, and of thy whole Family, &c.* *Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæsumus Benedictam, ascriptam, &c.* *Which Oblation we beseech thee, O God, being blessed, appropriated, &c.* *Thou wouldst vouchsafe to make acceptable, that it may be unto us the Body, and Blood of thy Son, our Lord, and God, Jesus Christ.* And then after the Words of the Institution: *Uade & Memores, &c.* *Wherefore, O Lord, we thy Servants, and also thy holy People, being mindful of the blessed Passion of thy Son our Lord God, &c.* *Offerimus præclaræ Majestati tuæ de tuis Donis, ac datis Hostiam puram, Hostiam Sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam, &c.* *We offer unto thy glorious Majesty of thy own Gifts and Benefits, a pure, holy, immaculate Sacrifice, the Bread of Eternal Life, and the Cup of Everlasting Salvation, upon which we beseech thee to look with a propitious Countenance, and to accept them, as thou didst the Gifts of thy righteous Servant Abel, &c.* To this I might add the Canon of the Eucharistical Action in the ancient Gallican Liturgy,

## 140 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Liturgy, published by <sup>e</sup> *Mabillon*, but because it is almost of the same with the former, I omit it. Many Collections and Observations of the same kind might also be extracted out of the elaborate and useful Volumes of the learned *Benedictin*, Edmund Martene, *de antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus*. But having produced enough out of the ancient Liturgies, to prove the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist from the harmonious agreement of them all in that point, I forbear to collect any more. Sir, I say the *harmonious agreement* of them all to prevent Cavil from such Men, as your *late Writer*: For in whatsoever they all agree among themselves, and every one of them with the account we have of the Eucharist, in *Justin Martyr's* Apology, and in the xii, xiii, and xiv. Chapters of the Apostolick Constitutions, (which answer so exactly to the Celebration of it, as described by *Justin*) that must needs be *Primitive*, and Apostolick, and the *consenting Suffrage*, i. e. the consentient Doctrine and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church.

Of this sort were the Salutation of the Bishop or Priest, at the Altar: *The Peace of God be with you all*: and the People's Answer, *And with thy Spirit. The Kiss of Peace*; The Priests washing his Hands before he began the Ministration. The Μη τις καλᾷ τινι, or Monition of the Deacon to the People, *that none should presume to communicate, who had injured his Brother*, and was not reconciled to him. *The stemus cum timore*, or, *Charge* to the Communicants to stand with Fear and Trembling before the Lord, to offer the. Sancta Sanctis, *holy things to holy Men*. The Apostolick Benediction of the Bishop standing in his Robes at the Altar: *The Grace of Almighty God, the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all*. To which the People answer'd, *And with*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 141

thy Spirit. Then the <sup>a</sup> *Sursum Corda*, *Lift up your Hearts*; and the People's Answer, *We lift them up unto the Lord*. Then let us give thanks unto the Lord; and the Answer, *It is meet and right so to do*: To which the Priest, *It is truly meet, and right, &c.* To these I must add the *Hymnus ter Sanctus*, or, *Holy, holy, holy, &c.* with which they concluded their Prayer of Thanksgiving. The *κράμα* or mixture of Water with the Sacramental Wine, which with the Bread, they offered up, as hath been shewn, to God the Father. The Words of the Institution; the Expressions of these Gifts here set before thee, these Gifts, of which thou standest not in need in the Prayer of Oblation, and after it, the Prayer of the Congregation to God, through Christ, for the Offering, that of his goodness through the Mediation of Jesus Christ, he would please to receive it unto his heavenly Altar for a sweet smelling Savour. To these again I must not forget to add the Prayer in the Consecration unto God the Father <sup>b</sup> to send down his holy Spirit upon the Sacrifice, to make the Bread the (mystical) Body, and the Cup the (mystical) Blood of Christ. This Prayer is expressly in all the Greek Liturgies, and virtually in the Latin, where they pray to God to sanctify the Gifts. The ancient Liturgies, how different soever among themselves, agree in all these things with Justin Martyr's Account of the Eucharist, and the Eucharistical Office in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which is the Standard, and Test by which all the others are to be tryed. And by comparing those with this, the Innovations, and Additions in after times, be they good or bad, will appear. Among the Innovations, Sir, some are more ancient than others, one of the ancientest of them I take to be the Use of *Incense*, men-

<sup>a</sup> Cyprian de Orat. Dom. *Sursum corda* — *respondent plebs habemus ad Dominum.*

<sup>b</sup> See Dr. Grabe's learned Notes on cap. 11. lib. v. of Irenæus, p. 399, 400.

## 142 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

tioned in the third of the Apostolical Canons, and in <sup>i</sup> *Hippolytus de Consum. Mundi, & de Antichr.* in these words: *πενθῶσι ὁ καὶ αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι, &c.* And there shall be great Lamentations among the Churches, because there is no Oblation, or Incense offered, nor any Service acceptable to God. But whoever this *Hippolytus* was, I think he could not be that *Hippolytus* Martyr, in the third Century, mention'd by *Eusebius*, who was the Friend of *Origen*: For who can believe that a Father of that Century could write in such a manner as this *Hippolytus* doth, viz. that Antichrist should be a Devil really born of a Strumpet, and yet not have a real Body, but only in Shew and Appearance; that among his other false Miracles, he should remove Mountains, and whirl the Sun about whither he pleased; that those who suffered Martyrdom under his Tyranny, should be more blessed and illustrious Martyrs than those, who suffered in ancient Persecutions, because they overcame the Devil himself: that St. *John* did not die, and other false, and vain Conjectures, and Opinions observed, and censured by <sup>k</sup> *Dupin* and <sup>l</sup> *Tillemond*. To which I might add some Expressions, which do not savour of that Age in which *Hippolytus* liv'd. As *Ἱεράρχαι* for Bishops, a Word perhaps not used before the *Pseudo-Dionysius*, who wrote at the latter end of the

<sup>i</sup> Vol. II. Bibl. Patrum Parisiis, MDCXXIV. p. 357.

<sup>k</sup> *Les Livres d'Hippolyte étoient, intitulés, De la Resurrection & De l'Antichrist. Suivant le rapport d'Eusebe, & de S. Jerome: Celuy-cy est intitulé, de la Consummation du monde, &c. Le stile est basse, & puerile, au lieu que celui d'Hippolyte étoit grave, & élevé— Il y a beaucoup de vaines Conjectures sur la naissance, & sur la vie de Antichrist. Il croit qui sera un demon; Il dit que S. Jean n'est point mort, ce qui est contraire a l'ancienne Tradition; Il cite l'Apocalypse pour Daniel. Il tient que les Ames des hommes on, esté de tout tems, ce qui revient a l'opinion d'Origenes. Enfin ce traité est de tres peu d'utilité.*

<sup>l</sup> *Tillemond's Memoires. Tome III. Partie 2. Notes sur S. Hippolyte, p. 351. Edit. Bruxell.*

<sup>m</sup> P. 360. *Δεῦτε Ἱεράρχαι, &c.*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 143

fourth Century : Such are the Words in that Address to Christ, <sup>n</sup> Σὺ εἶ ὁ Σὺ ἀναρχὸς, &c. *Thou art without beginning with the Father, and \* co eternal to the Holy Spirit.* Of the same Nature is that : *Come to the Kingdom prepared for you, and enjoy it for ever from my Father which is in Heaven,* <sup>p</sup> Καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀμήν, and the most holy quickning Spirit. Which shews, that he must have lived after the second General-Council, which met at Constantinople to condemn Macedonius. And as for the third of the Apostolical Canons, that Collection being of Canons, and Customs of different Ages, it is of no Authority to prove that *Incense was offered*, much less that it was offered up with Prayer in the Eucharist, at least in the three first Centuries, in the Writers whereof there is no mention of it. Another Innovation is the *Oratio Propositionis*, or Prayer at the *Prothesis*, or Table upon which the Bread and Wine was set and prepared for the holy Altar. To which I may add the *Oratio Velaminis*, or Prayer upon removing the covering from off the Mysteries : None of which are in the Office of the *Apost. Constitutions*.

Among the *Additions* some are good, and some bad. And any Man, who is conversant in the History of the Councils, may see how, and when both the sorts were introduced into the Liturgies of the Church. Of the first sort is the Word ὁμοῦσι in acknowledging the Son to be of the same Substance with the Father, which likely was not brought into the Liturgies before the first Council of *Nice* ; The *Constantinopolitan*, commonly called the *Nicene Creed*, which could not be introduced before the second General Council of *Constantinople* ; The Benediction in the Name of the Holy, Consubstantial, and Adorable Trinity, which must have come in after one of

<sup>n</sup> P. 360. Δεῦτε Ἱερεῖς αἱ, &c.

<sup>p</sup> Σὺ ἀρχὴ. ib.

<sup>p</sup> Ib. those

# 144 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

those two Councils. The Epithets added to the Holy Spirit <sup>a</sup> in the Prayer of Oblation, in which they did not only call him τὸ παρακλητικὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὴν ἀληθείαν, the Paraclete the Spirit of Truth, but τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιον, the Lord, the giver of Life, who spake in the Law, the Prophets, and Apostles, and who worketh sanctifying Grace in all αὐτεξουσίᾳ, & ἀρχονικῶς, by his own Power, not as a Minister, ἐκ πο-  
 ρεύματος, ὁμοούσιον, (ὡς γεννᾷ, proceeding from the Father, being consubstantial to the Father, and sitting upon the same Throne with him, and his Son Jesus Christ. This must have been added after the second General Council of Constantinople καὶ τὸ συνδυασματικῶν. In the same Liturgy is this Invocation of Christ of the same date κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἀκατάληπτε Θεὸς λόγε, τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι ὁμοούσιε, (ὡσὶς-  
 οῦς, καὶ (ὡσὶς παρῇ, O Lord our God, the incompre-  
 hensible Word of God, of one Substance with, and coeter-  
 nal to the Father, and the Holy Spirit, and without  
 beginning, accept our Hymn, &c. <sup>b</sup> So the Expression  
 Ἀνθρώπου ἐκ θεογονίας, who was made Man not by  
 Conversion [of the Godhead into Flesh] must have  
 been added after the fourth General Council of Chal-  
 cedon against Dioscorus, and Eutyches. So wherefo-  
 ever we find the blessed Virgin called ἁγία Θεοτόκη,  
 we may presume it was an addition brought in after  
 the third General Council at Ephesus, against Nestorius,  
 who not believing Christ to be God, would only call  
 her χριστοτόκη, the Mother of Christ, though as the  
 Fathers of that Council shew'd, she was called ΘΕΟ-  
 ΤΟΚΟΣ by the Writers of the Church in the Ages  
 before. And with these Additions I may take no-  
 tice of the Alteration from the ancient Form of Ob-  
 lation of the Elements to God the Father to the Ob-  
 lation of them to God the Son, as an acknowledg-

<sup>a</sup> Liturg. S. Marci S. Jacobi.

<sup>b</sup> Liturg. S. Jacobi.

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 145

ment of his Godhead in the proper Offices (as I have observed before upon the *Aethiopick* Liturgy) for *Christmas*, *Easter*, and *Ascension-day*; which could not come, I think, into use till after the first Council of *Nice*.

But then after the second Council of *Nice* were introduced Additions of the latter sort, whereby the Liturgies were most abominably corrupted by *Commemorations*, *Salutations*, *Gratulations* of the *Holy Virgin*, and *desiring to be heard through her Intercessions*, and the *Intercessions* of other *Saints*. Among these Additions I may also reckon their superstitious Practices, as putting warm Water to the Sacramental Wine, saying Prayers at putting on every Vestment in the robing of the Priest, making the Sign of the Cross upon the *Δώδεκα*, and ' the late Addition of *σωτηριώ-της*, the Mother of the crucified God to *Δεσποτή*, the Mother of God. Thus, Sir, by animadverting upon the Innovations, Additions, and Corruptions which have crept into the ancient Liturgies, I have thereby shew'd you the Apostolical Antiquity, Simplicity, and Purity of the ancient Eucharistical Office in the *Apostolick Constitutions*, and by consequence whatever the other Liturgies have in common with it, and with one another must be primitive, and pure. In particular the harmonious Testimony of them all with it, and with one another, and with the Fathers, and Councils, for the Eucharistical Oblation is such a proof for the truth of it, that he that will not submit to such concurrent Evidence, may bring into Controversy, not to mention other things received by the Church in all Ages, the Divine Authority of the inspired Writings, Infant-Baptism, Episcopacy, the Lord's Day, and even the Divinity of our Lord, and Saviour Jesus Christ, and so at once blow up

---

' In Liturg. Antec. consecratorum. Bibl. Patr. Vol. II. Parisiis. MDCXXIV.

## 146 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Catholick Faith, and Church. I wish, *Sir*, your *late Author*, and such Men would consider this, and not give such advantage to *Deists* and *Sceptricks* by standing out against such a noble Tradition, as is supported by *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent.*

Thus, *Sir*, I have gone through the Fathers, and Councils, and ancient Liturgies to prove the Eucharist to be a real Oblation, or Sacrifice, and by consequence, that the Ministers of it are proper Priests, as the Bishops, and Presbyters of the ancient Catholick Church thought, and taught themselves to be, according to that of St. Cyprian de Orat. Dom. *Quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus, & Sacrificia divina cum Dei Sacerdote celebramus.* But as Men biased by Preconceptions are apt to object: So such Men, as your *late Writer*, taking the Notion of a Sacrifice from Dr. *Outram*, who is a great Author with them, object his Definition of a Sacrifice to the sacrificial Notion of the Holy Eucharist, which they truly say do not agree together. And therefore I must acknowledge, that either he is mistaken in his Definition, or that the ancient Church hath erred in the sacrificial Conception they had of the Holy Eucharist, which must be false, if the Doctor's Definition, or Description of a Sacrifice be strictly true. Wherefore, *Sir*, before I proceed to my other Proofs of the Christian Priesthood, you must give me leave to examine Dr. *Outram's* Definition of a Sacrifice, which they oppose to the sacrificial *Idea* the Ancients had of the holy Mystery, and I here give it you in his own Words, which you'll find in the 82<sup>d</sup> Page of his Book. A Sacrifice, *saieth he*, may be thus defined, *Ut sit προσφορὰ rite consumpta*, seu ut paulo explicatius dicam SACRIFICIUM apud populum Hebraum, ejusmodi erat sacrum, quod cum Deo oblatum erat, tum rite confectum, & consumptum. That is in English, A Sacrifice is *an Oblation*



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 147*

*Oblation* \* *rightly consumed.* Or that I may speak more plainly, a *Sacrifice* among the Hebrews, was such a holy thing, as was both offered to God, and rightly destroyed and consumed. Now, say they, this Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice is not applicable to the *Holy Eucharist*, in which there is nothing consumed, nor poured out either upon the *Lord's Table*, or at the bottom of it, as was usual for the Blood to be poured upon the Altar, in order to make an Atonement for Sin, or to be sprinkled round about upon the Altar; nor is there any Wine poured out on the Lord's Table, or upon the Bread, as it was formerly upon the Sacrifice; nor are there any remainders of our Blessed Lord's natural Body, who was sacrificed, to be taken by the Communicants: How therefore the *Sacrament* wanting these Sacrificial Rites, should come under the Notion of a Sacrifice (saith the Objector) I cannot conceive.

Sir, I have given you the Words of the Objection; as I received them, and I shall lay several Answers to it before you, and leave you to judge whether they are satisfactory, or not. *First*, Then I pray you to consider, That the ancient Writers of the Church knew the Nature of Sacrifices, both Jewish and Gentile, as well as any Christian Writers since the Reformation; and yet, as I have often observed, and sufficiently shew'd, they were so far from apprehending any Inconsistency between the Notion of a Sacrifice, and the Nature of the Holy Eucharist, that they <sup>all</sup> believed, and thought it to be a pure commemorative Sacrifice, foretold by the Prophets, and instituted by Christ, and solemnly offered it as such. *Secondly*, I must intreat you to consider, that

---

\* Or *Ritely*, i. e. according to the Holy Rites appointed by God.

† *Petrus de Marca* de Sacrificio Missæ: *Hoc est novum Christianæ legis externum Sacrificium, ut summo consensu docent omnes antiqui Patres, nemine dempto, qui hanc esse Oblationem mundam, qua tota orbe offerenda erat à Malachia prænuntiata restantur.*

## 148 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Dr. *Ouram's* Definition of a Sacrifice, is, as he confesseth, of a Jewish or Levitical Sacrifice, and doth it follow, from his Definition, that every thing that belongs to a Jewish Sacrifice, or the Definition of it, must belong to the *Christian Oblation of Bread and Wine*, which was appointed instead of all the Levitical Sacrifices, or else that it cannot be such? The Law is changed, and the Priesthood is changed, as the Apostle observes in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and with them the Altar and Sacrifice is changed too, as *St. Irenaeus* saith in the Words I cited before in the Margin, *God hath not rejected Oblations, but as they had Oblations, so have we; there were Sacrifices among that People, and there are Sacrifices in the Church, the Species, or kind of Sacrifices being only changed.* Wherefore since the Christian Religion is another sort of Religion different in so many things from the Jewish, is it reasonable to try and examine the one external Sacrifice of that Religion so nicely and strictly by that Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice? or to reject it as a Sacrifice, because it doth not in every point agree with that *Test*? Wherefore supposing the formal Reason of a Sacrifice in the Jewish Church consisted in the Destruction, and Consumption of the Oblation, or some part of it upon the Altar, or at the bottom of it, must it of necessity be so in the Christian Religion, which hath changed the Rites, and reduced the number of Sacrifices to one, and alter'd the whole Frame of the Jewish, or Levitical Worship, which Dr. *Ouram* hath described? For the same Reason, as I observed upon another occasion, they may deny our Churches where the Christian Sacrifice is offered, to be Temples, because *Ben. Maimon's*, or the Doctor's Description of the Jewish Temple is not applicable to them; or that the true Notion of divine Worship belongs to the Christian way of worshipping God, because it is so different from that of the Jews.

There

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 149

There were many other Rites belonging to Jewish Sacrifices, besides Destruction, and Consumption in whole, or in part at the Altar, as *heaving*, and *waving* in the *Therumahs* and *Thenuphas*, and *eating*, or Participation of the Things sacrificed, either by the Priests alone, as in the Sin-offerings, and Trespass-offerings, or by the Offerers as well as the Priests, as in the *Peace-offerings*, which of all Levitical Sacrifices the Eucharist most resembles, and by consequence, from this Objection brought against the Christian Sacrifice, the Objectors may also, if they please, say that the Holy Eucharist cannot be such, because it is not held up to Heaven, or waved towards the four Corners of it, as well as because it is not in whole, or in part consumed upon the Altar. But though it hath not these, it hath many other Sacrificial Rites belonging to it; for the Bread, and Wine are brought to the Christian Temple, and Altar, and delivered to the Christian *Cohen*, or Minister, who stands on God's part to receive them of the People, and on the Peoples part to offer them up for them to God; and when the Oblation is finished, both Priest and People together *participate* of the Offerings at God's Table, which signifies, as it did in the Jewish Religion, that the Communicants are in a State of Favour, and Friendship with God. I would fain ask these Gentlemen, if these three holy Rites, without others, and especially without Destruction, and Consumption in the Jewish manner, are not by God's Appointment, who is the Arbiter of religious Rites, and Ceremonies, sufficient to make a Sacrifice? If they will say, they are not sufficient, let them give their Reasons for it. But if they will acknowledge they are, then let them no more deny the Holy *Eucharist* to be a true and proper Sacrifice, because Dr. *Ourram's* Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice is not applicable to it.

## 150 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

But, *Sir*, in the *third* place, a good Reason may be given from the Jewish Law of Sacrifices, why neither the Bread nor Wine of the Holy *Eucharist*, nor any part of them is so consumed; and that is, because the Christian Church hath no Scripture, or Tradition for such consumption of any part of them, and by consequence hath no such Altars, nor stands in need of any such Altars, as the *Jewish* had, for the consumption of her Offerings. Those Altars were the great brazen Altar without the House of the Temple, in the Inner-Court thereof. And the Golden Altar of Incense in the holy Place. And therefore the Christians having no such Levitical Rites, for consumption of the Elements in the *Jewish* manner, and after the *Jewish* Forms, they have no occasion for such Altars to consume them at, or upon. The same Fabrick serves them both for Altar and Table, and as I have shew'd in different respects was, and was deemed both the one, and the other, as the Jewish Altar was.

I might add, in the *fourth* place, in answer to this Objection, that by reason of the straight mystical Union, and Conjunction between the sacramental and natural Body and Blood of Christ, or between the represented, and representative Sacrifice, the Wine of the Holy Sacrament, which is the mystical and putative Blood of Sprinkling, <sup>w</sup> was, and always is, in full effect poured out, and sprinkled as that was upon the Cross by virtue of the divine Institution, whereby the Bread and Wine

---

<sup>w</sup> *De Marca de Sacrificio missæ. Neesse non est, ut rationem cuiusque sacrificii in viâima mactatione, vel interitu hostia constituamus, cum sufficiat sola rei sensibilis ad honorem Divini Numini ipsius decreto oblata dicatio, quæ illi a ministro publico dicatur. Quamvis in Sacrificio Eucharistico non deest quoque suo modo mysticus viâima interitus, si quis jam quoque conditionem in sacrificio veri ratione desideret.*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 151

are substituted, and \* deputed in the Lord's Supper for his Body, and Blood, and in virtue of that deputation are to be <sup>v</sup> deem'd, taken, and esteemed as his natural Body and Blood. This Power in Legislators of making, and supposing things to be to all Intents and Purposes, and Effects in Law, what in reality they are not, is called by the *Civil Law Fiction*; but it is such Fiction, as is invented to produce real and true Effects for the Benefit of those, for whose sake it is by Authority devised. Thus many of the Roman Laws imagine a Child in the Womb to be born, and a Man who lives or dies in Captivity, to have lived or died at home, and therefore the Maxims of *Fiction* are such as these: *Fictio imitatur naturam*; *Fictio inducitur, ut suppleat id, in quo desideratur facti veritas, ut ex ea producantur veri juris effectus*; and *Fictio juris tantum operatur, quantum veritas*, or *Fictio tantum valet in re ficta, quantum veritas in re vera*. There is no Law, or Government without such *Fictions*; ours hath many of them, as when it supposes and imagines our captive or exiled Kings, to whom it allows *jus postliminii*, to be all the time of their Absence in possession of their Thrones. So it is in the case of the King's *putative* or *virtual* Presence, the Law supposing him at the same time to be present, not only in every Room of his Palace, but in all his Courts of Judicature, and in all the Places of his

---

\* Mr. Thorndike of *Religious Assemblies*, p. 357, 358. The Creatures of Bread and Wine are deputed to the effect of becoming the Body and Blood of Christ——it seems unquestionable that the Thanksgiving—contained also Prayer to God for the effect to which the Elements, when they became this Sacrament, are deputed. In the true sense of the Church they are consecrated, that is deputed to this Sacrament. Let me suppose in the first place, that the Elements by being deputed, &c.

† Poinet's *Dialecticon*, p. 33. *Hoc corpus, hunc sanguinem non communi more, nec ut humana ratio dicitur, accipi oportere, sed ita nominari, existimari, credi, propter eximios quosdam effectus, virtutes, &c.*

## 152 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Dominions, though his real Person can be but in one at a time. So in virtue of legal Substitution, the Procurator or Attorney is his Principal, the Ambassador his King, and the Sentence of the Judge the King's Sentence. In like manner, *Sir*, there are *Fictions* in Divinity, which infinite Wisdom and Goodness hath devised for our Benefit and Advantage. Thus Man and Wife are supposed to be, and therefore are made *one Flesh*, as the Law makes them *one Person*. Thus Christ is supposed to be the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; thus *Abraham's* believing of God was imputed unto him for Righteousness, and by this *putative*, or imputative Righteousness, he was as righteous in God's Account, as if he had never sinn'd. Thus also are the faithful still justified by divine Imputation, as it is written, *It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth?* Thus also the Doctrine of *Adoption* is a divine Fiction in the Gospel, as it was an *human* Fiction in the *Roman* Civil Law, and in both Cases hath all the Effects of real and legitimate Sonship. And therefore in answer to these Mens Objections, I hope it is no great, or dangerous Paradox to say, that by *divine Fiction*, or *Substitution*, the Bread is made the Body, and the Wine the Blood of Christ in the Holy Mystery, and that by virtue of this Substitution, and mystical Union between them, his Body is supposed, and deemed to be broken, and his Blood shed, and sprinkled in the Holy Sacrament, as it was upon the Cross, or in other Words, that the offering, and breaking of the Bread is supposed to be the offering, and breaking of his Body; and the pouring out of the Wine, the effusion and sprinkling of his Blood; and in this mystical Union, and Relation between them, and real Identity, as to all spiritual Virtues and Effects, the *Mystery* of the Holy Eucharist doth consist.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 153

Sir, I have said all this upon supposition, that Dr. *Outram's* Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice, as these Objectors suppose, is general, adequate, and just. But they are much mistaken in arguing from it, as such; because it is not a Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice in general, but of one Sort and Species of it, as any Man will be convinced, who will peruse Dr. *Bright's* accurate Tables of Jewish Sacrifices or Oblations, in which he'll find Sacrifices distinguished into those which were consumed, and those of which nothing was consumed. Dr. *Outram* therefore gives us too narrow a Definition; a definition of the *Species*, and not of the *Genus*, and by consequence in their way of arguing, excludes not only the Holy Eucharist, but many Jewish Oblations from the Nature and Notion of Sacrifice, as the offering of the First-fruits, of which it is said, *Levit. ii. 12. As for the Oblation of the First-fruits, ye shall offer them unto the Lord, but they shall not be<sup>2</sup> burnt on the Altar for a sweet Savour.* This Oblation is called *Corban* in the Text; the general Word among the Hebrews for an Oblation or Sacrifice, and is used in speaking of Offerings by Blood and Slaughter, as well as other things. <sup>1</sup> And *Maimonides* reckons it among the Sacrifices, which were neither in whole, nor in part consumed. It also excludes the red Heifer out of the Number of proper Sacrifices, *Numb. xix.* though it was brought to *Eleazar* Chief of the Priests, and slain before his Face, and he took of her Blood with his Finger, and sprinkled it directly before the Tabernacle seventimes, and had the whole Essence of a piacular and expiatory Sacrifice, as the Jews observe; in a Word, though it was one of the most <sup>b</sup> eminent Types of the expiatory Sacrifice of Christ

---

<sup>2</sup> Vatablus. Non imponitur Altari, ut incendantur expiaturæ Nidorem Domino, quia debent quidem offerri Deo primitiæ, sed non debent adoleri, quod cedant in cibum sacerdotum.

<sup>a</sup> De culto Divino. V. Tract. cap. xiii.

<sup>b</sup> Heb. xiii. 11.

## 154 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

upon the Cross, yet Dr. *Outram* by the Restrictions of his own Definition, excludes it out of the Number of Sacrifices, because it is not called *Corban*, and slain at the Altar, as other Sacrifices were. The learned Bishop *Patrick* in his Commentary upon the place, favours this Opinion of Dr. *Outram*, against *Abarbanel*, who calls the red Heifer an Offering for Sin. And as the Testimony of that *Rabbi*, as to the Nature and Notion of Sacrifices, is great: So Dr. *Bright*, who is of the same Opinion, reckons it among the *Animal Sacrifices*, and with a respectful Correction of Dr. *Outram*'s Opinion, thinks it ought to be called a *Corban*, or Sacrifice, as you may see by his Words in the Margin. It likewise excludes the *Scape-Goat* out of the Number of Sacrifices, because it was not slain, and consumed by Fire like the other Goat, although they were both alike presented before the Lord at the Door of the Tabernacle, and both alike were presented for the same use, and for the same end to make <sup>a</sup> Atonement. Nay, tho' the *Scape-Goat*, after the Lot fell upon him to be sent

---

<sup>a</sup> Hanc enim קרבן oblationem dici posse puto, aliter ac doctissimo Outramo, & in istis scriptori diligentissimo visum est. De Sacrificiis, Cap. IV. Quippe cuius sanguinis coram tentorio conventus aspersio, Deo offerendi aliquid ritus haberi debeat, etiamsi ea ipsa Ara Admota nunquam fuerit: Id quod in agno Paschali manifestum. Is enim, etiamsi nunquam pro Ara sisteretur, sed aspersam duntaxat super Altare sanguinem haberet, & quidem juxta Judeorum nonnullos, evaporatum Adipem, Oblatio tamen Dei, קרבן יחיה dicitur, Num. 9.

<sup>a</sup> Fagius in Lev. xvi. 8. Hircus super quam ascendit sors pro Azazel, statuatur vivus coram domino, ut per eum expiationem faciat. Græci interpres pro voce Hebraica Azazel posuit Ἀποκμπάων, qua nomine Græci vocant malorum depulsores. Hinc & Deos, quos coluerunt ad depellenda mala, vocarunt Ἀποκμπάτες, ἢ Ἀπολεπταίς, aut etiam Ἀλεξίκακους. Respexerunt ergo Græci eo, quod iste caper peccata populi causam omnium malorum in desertum auferret. Pontifex enim imprecabatur confessione suâ capiti hujus capri omnia peccata Israelitarum, & emittebat eum postea in desertum, ut esset pro omnibus peccatis totius Israelitici populi expiatio. Hoc recte dicitur Ἀποκμπάων esse ad auferenda, & expianda peccata populi.

away,



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 155

away, was presented alive before the Lord a second time, and so was twice consecrated, and devoted to God, to remove the Sins of the Congregation far from him, and, as it were, to carry them out of his sight. Yet for all this Dr. *Outram* will not allow it to be a proper Sacrifice, because it was not consumed according to his narrow Definition, which is perfectly contrary to the Opinion of *Maimonides*, and I believe of all other Jewish Writers, who reckon both Goats alike among the number of Sacrifices, as do also our own Writers, Mr. *Ainsworth*, Bishop *Patrick*, and Dr. *Bright*, who also reckons both Goats among the publick Sacrifices of the Jewish Church.

I have said, that I believe all Jewish Writers reckon both Goats alike amongst the number of Sacrifices. For so I doubt not but the LXXII did, who called the *Scape-goat* ἁπομιμῆαιος, that is the piacular Goat, because he was offered to be a Piacle, and as such sent away into the Wilderness laden with all the Sins of the People. So St. *Barnabas*, who was a Jew, for this reason calls him κατάρατος the accursed Goat, and as such saith that he was a Type of Christ. Hear. (saith he) the appointment of Christ: take two Goats unblemished, and alike, and offer them, and let the High-priest take one of them for a <sup>h</sup> Burnt-offering. And what must be done with the other? Let it, saith he, be accursed. And afterwards: one was offered upon the Altar, and the other to be accursed. Both then were offered; the one to be a Sin-offering,

\* De cultu divino, Tract. VIII. Cap. I. Præterea autem de publico offerebantur hirci duo — itaque ad diem illum sacrificabantur bestia quindecim: jugia sacrificia duo, juvencus — præterea hirci duo in hostiam pro peccato.

<sup>f</sup> In hunc porro publicarum oblationum censum reponimus in die expiationis hircos duos. Quorum unum erat piacularis casus, alter emissarius pro expiatione Sanctuarii, Altaris, totiusque Cætus.

<sup>g</sup> Lev. xvi. 8, 10.

<sup>h</sup> Sin-offering, Lev. xvi. 5.

## 156 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the other for a *Piacle*, to bear all the Iniquities of the Children of *Israel*, and the Curses due unto them in the *Type*, as Christ our *Piacle* in the *Anti-type* bore the Sins of the whole World in his Body upon the Tree. If therefore a Goat solemnly offered before the Altar to be a *Piacle*, and to make <sup>i</sup> *Atonement*, and Expiation for the Transgressions of the People be a proper Sacrifice, such was the *Scape-goat*, though he was not slain, nor any of his Blood put upon the Horns of the Altar, or poured out at the bottom thereof, nor his Fat, and Kidneys consumed upon the Altar by Fire.

So *Just. Mart.* after he had said that one of the Goats was to be Αὐτομπαῖς, and the other to be slain εἰς ἁγιοσύνην, he speaks of the *Oblation* of both of them in these words ; καὶ ὅτι δὴ ἡ τὸ δύο τεύχος ἡ μείλα καὶ ὁ θύσις τῶν ἀγίων, ἀγίασμα ἵνα μὴ ἐν ἁγιασμοῖς, ἐμίσαι. So far was he from thinking the Consumption of an Offering, or any part of it upon the Altar necessary to make it a Sacrifice.

Sir, I hope, I have now made it appear with what little Reason the *Holy Eucharist* is denied to be a Sacrifice, because Dr. *Ourram*'s narrow Definition of a Jewish Sacrifice is not applicable to the Institution of it, nor the Institution of it to that Definition, which is neither so general as to answer the Notion of a Sacrifice common to all Religions, or to take in all the sorts of Jewish Sacrifices, or Oblations. I say, of Jewish Sacrifices, or Oblations, because Sacrifice and Oblation are equivalent Terms in the Old Testament, which I premise for the sake of those, who, according to the more common use of the Words in our Language, make a Distinction between them, restraining the Word *Sacrifice* to *Victims*, or *Animal Oblations*, and *Oblation* to the Sacri-

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 157

fices of *inanimate Things*, contrary to the Usage of other Languages and Authors, and particularly of Dr. *Outram* himself, who makes Sacrifice a *GENUS* to Animal and Inanimate Sacrifices in these Words: *Nos omnia Sacrificia quæ ex animantibus lecta erant victimas, aut hostias appellabimus, reliqua autem\* fecta, aut dapes*, I shall call all Sacrifice of Animals *Victims*, or *Hosts*, and the rest *Meat-offerings*, or *Feasts*.

Sir, This Observation, and the Remarks I have made upon Dr. *Outram*'s Definition of a Sacrifice, will perhaps make you think it incumbent upon me to give another Definition of it so general as may take in not only all sorts of Jewish, but Gentile Sacrifices, and which if it be a good Definition, may also prove the *Holy Sacrament* to be such. But if you expect such a Definition of a Sacrifice, or Oblation, as a *Genus* to all sorts of Sacrifices, or Oblations from me, you expect a most difficult thing. For *General* Terms come so near to the Nature of *Transcendentals*, that they are very seldom capable of a strict, proper, and exact Definition, though the Nature of Things signify'd by them may be clearly conceived. Such Terms are usually described, rather than defined, and learned Men content themselves with the unaccurate Descriptions of them, because they can have no better. So the Schools acquiesce in this Definition of *SUBSTANCE*, *Substantia est quod per se subsistit*, or *Substantia est ens per se subsistens*, that is, *Substance is what subsists by its self*, or *Substance is a thing that subsists by its self*, which is no more than *Substance is Substance*, and so is rather a *Description*, than a *Definition*, and a Description rather of the Name, than the thing; and yet though we can have

---

\* *Fertum*, Hebraice *Minchah* quod vocabulum speciatim sumitur pro libi quodam genere, quod Deo sacrificabatur — Hoc vulg. interpret simpliciter sacrificium nominat. Comp. de Viel. in Cap. II. Tract. V. Maimonides de Sacrificiis.

## 158 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

no better a Definition of it, every illiterate, as well as every learned Man conceives what is meant by *Substance*, and hath a clear Notion of it, though he never heard it defined. The like may be said of *Ens* a *Being*, or *Thing*, defined to be *Quod habet Essentiam*, which is but a nominal Definition, or Explication of the Term, though every vulgar Understanding knows what a *Being*, or *Thing* means, and would have a right *Idea* thereof, though it had never been defined.

Sir, I have observed this to let you know you are not to expect an exact Definition of a *Sacrifice* from me, which contains under it so many, and various *Species*, and Divisions, and Subdivisions, as in examining Dr. *Outram's* too narrow Definition of a *Sacrifice* hath appeared. But then, Sir, though I cannot give you such a Definition of a *Sacrifice* in general, as perhaps you expect; nay though I should give you none at all, yet I must profess I have a clear generical Notion of it, as I have of *Time*, though it is very hard to find Terms to express it in. I instance in *Time*, because all Men alike have a clear Notion of it, though the *Philosopher's* Definition of it in his *Physicks* is imperfect, and liable to Exceptions, and short of the common Notion thereof. Wherefore, Sir, I hope you'll be content with any tolerable Description of a *Sacrifice* in general, because it is not capable of a perfect Definition, and that you will consider the Cases, in which the Schools tell us we must take up with *Descriptions*, particularly in the Cases expressed in the <sup>1</sup> Margin. Thus far, Sir, to bespeak your Candor in censuring, and examining the Description I shall give of a *Sacrifice*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Quoties ipsi inopia Laboramus aut verarum differentiarum aut verborum, quibus eas exprimamus: quorum utrumque ex eo sapissime contingit, quod quæ rerum naturæ atque essentiae sunt nobis plerumque parum satis cognita, neque suppetunt usque dictiones exprimendis animi conceptionibus satis idonea, &c. Sanderfon's Log. Cap. 16.*



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 159

in general, which if I should describe but *nominally* by the mere Notation, or Etymology of the Word, I think I might be excused. For there are some consecrated things, that have a near alliance and resemblance with Sacrifices, and yet are not Sacrifices, though it is not so easy for want of Words to express the difference between them.

But before I can define a Sacrifice, or Oblation in general, you must give me leave to distinguish the Words into their several Acceptations. For they are sometimes used for the whole *Sacrificial Administration*, and sometimes for the *Res oblata*, or *Thing sacrificed*. And therefore the Administration of the *Holy Sacrament* being called a Sacrifice, as well as the Bread, and Wine, I shall give you two Descriptions of a Sacrifice, one, as it is taken for the *ιεργεια*, or holy Administration, and the other as it is taken for the matter of the Sacrifice, the holy Gift. But before I proceed to my two Descriptions, or if you please, you may call them Explications of the Word, I must beg leave to put in this previous *Caveat*, that if they do not rightly answer the general Conceptions we have of Sacrifice in both Senses, it is not for want of a true Notion of them, but rather of Words significant enough in our Language to express them in.

In the first Sense I define a Sacrifice thus: *A Sacrifice is a religious Action [or Operation] of a Priest ordinary, or extraordinary, by which a GIFT brought, is solemnly offered according to the Rites, and Observances of any Religion in, before, at, or upon any place, unto any GOD, to honour, and worship him, and thereby acknowledge him to be God and Lord.*

Sir, you will now easily imagine, that in the second sense I shall define a *Sacrifice* in this manner: *A Sacrifice is a Gift brought, and solemnly offered by a Priest ordinary, or extraordinary according to the Rites, and Observances of any Religion in, before, at, or*  
upon

## 160 The Christian Priesthood Asserted.

upon any place, unto any GOD, to honour, and worship him, and thereby acknowledge him to be God and Lord.

If my first Definition be good, the second must be so, and therefore let me observe to you, first; that it agrees to the Notation of *Sacrificium*, and answers to the Terms of *Sacrificing*, Δρῶν, Ἐρῶν, Πέζων, Ποιῶν in Greek, קריב in Hebrew, and *Facere* in Latin, as above explain'd. The *summm Genus* therefore of Sacrifice, for *Sacrificing*, must be *Action*, and *Actions*, as the Schools tell us, must be defined by their *Subject*, *Object*, *Efficient*, and *End*: all which I have endeavoured to comprise in the first Definition, as well as the thing defined, and the want of more proper Words would bear. The *Subject* of this holy Action is a *Gift* brought; the *Object* to whom it is brought, is any *God*; the *Efficient* who offers the Gift brought, is a *Priest*; and the *End* of offering that Gift, is to worship that God to whom it is offered, and acknowledge him to be God, and Lord. I have said a Priest ordinary, or extraordinary to comprehend the holy Administration of those, who sacrifice, or offer *Jure Prophetico* upon particular Occasions. As in the first Definition I have made *Gift* the *Subject* of offering, or sacrificing: so in the second I have put it for the *Genus proximum* of Sacrifice according to the *Hebrews*, *Greeks*, and *Latins*, who call it in the proper, sacrificial Signification קרבן ΔΩΡON, <sup>m</sup> DONUM, as distinguished from other *Gifts*, which were upon any account hang'd up in Temples, or fasten'd to

<sup>m</sup> Briffon. de formulis, p. 34.

<sup>n</sup> Martini Lexicon Philol. in Donarium. Macrob. Saturn. lib. iii. cap. xii. Ornamenta vero sunt Clypei, Corona, &c ejusmodi DONARIA. Jul. Pollucis Onomast. Sect. 25. lib. i. cap. i. τὰ Ἀνθηματῶν, καὶ λειψίων προσφερόμενα. Phavorini Gloss. in ANAΘΗΜΑ. See the Word in *Suiceri Thesaur.* Col. 272. And in *Budæi Comment. Ling. Græcæ*, p. 32, 33.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 161

Altars, which they called <sup>p</sup> אֲנָתְחָמָה, ANAΘHMA-TA, DONARIA, though among the *Latins* *Donum* is sometimes us'd for *Donarium*, as in that of *Virgil* *Æn.* lib. xii.

*Servati ex undis ubi Figere Dona solebant.*

So ANAΘHMA is render'd by DONUM 2 *Mac-*  
*cab.* ix. but in the 2<sup>d</sup> Chapter, v. 13. it is ren-  
der'd by DONARIUM, and again by DONUM,  
as in our Translation, *Luk.* xxi. 5. But in 2 *Mac-*  
*cab.* ii. 13. we render ANAΘHMATΩN by *holy*  
*Gifts*; for both *Sacrifices*, and *Gifts* signify'd by 'Ανα-  
θήματα, and *Donaria* agreed in this, that they were  
consecrated, but then the latter were said to be de-  
dicated, and not *offered*, as *Sacrifices*, or *Oblations*  
are always said to be. Before the Word *Gift* I  
have put the Word *brought*, as it is written, *Gen.*  
iv. 3, 4. *Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, and*  
*Abel brought of the firstlings of his Flock an Offering*  
*unto the Lord.* Hence these scriptural Words in  
*Hebrew* הקריב הקריב זבוא for bringing to the Priest,  
and Altar. This the *Greeks* express by ἡγε-  
γεν, Ἀναείνευ, the *Latins* by *Ducere*, and *admo-*  
*vere*, of which in the proper sacrificial Sense see  
*Brissonus* at large *de formul.* p. 17, 18.

I need say nothing of the Word *offered*, but  
that I mean by it *actually offered*, and that joined  
with *brought*, it denotes a *Sacrifice* or *Oblation*  
*offered*, or to be offered, as <sup>a</sup> *Buxtorf* saith, *Corban*  
*est oblatio, sacrificium quod offertur, aut offerri debet.*  
But what is actually offered is most properly called  
a *Sacrifice*, or *Oblation*: for as *Gregory Nyssen* some-  
where speaks, A Sheep before it is offered is but a

<sup>p</sup> Jul. Pollucis Onomast. lib. i. §. 26. ἀνὰ τὴν προσάγειαν  
ἱερῶν.

<sup>a</sup> Lexic. Talm.

## 162 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Sheep*, but being offered it becomes what it was not before, a Sacrifice to God.

I have also said offer'd *in, before, at, or upon* any place to distinguish Sacrifices from Temples, and Altars, which are also said to be 'consecrated, and dedicated, *upon which account they become holy*, but are never said to be offered. I have used the Word *before*, because in religious Ritualities it is all one as to the nature of a Sacrifice, whether it be offered *before*, or *towards* the place of the special Presence, or Residence of any Deity, or in it, if the Pontifical Laws and Usages so direct, or permit. So as I have shew'd before, the 'red Heifer, which was slain before Eleazer the Priest, who sprinkled her Blood seven times directly before the Tabernacle, was as ritual and perfect a Sacrifice of Expiation, as if she had been slain at the Altar, and the Priest had sprinkled her Blood thereupon. Temples therefore, and Altars, properly speaking, are not Gifts, or Offerings, but only holy Places in, and at which Gifts are offered; Places, I say, for so *Jul. Pollux* calls them, *Lib. I. Sect. 2.* 'Ο τόπος ἐν ᾧ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦνται, *Of the place in which the Gods are worshipped.* Καὶ τὸ μὲν χαρπεῖον, &c. And the place in which we worship the Gods is ἱερεῖον and Νεώς. So *Sect. 54.* speaking of the Altar: saith he, the place upon which we Sacrifice and burn the Fire is, Βωμὸς, θυσιαστηρίον, Ἑστία, &c. And in *Sect. 5.* he calls the Ἐχάδρα, or Grate of the Altar, ὁ δεξιὸς τόπος τῷ θυσιῶν, *The place which receives the Sacrifices.*

I have also added, according to the Rites, and Customs of any Religion, because as there never was any Religion without Priests, and some Sacrifice, so

\* So *Thomas Aquinas*, l. 2. qu. c. 11. *Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod sacrificia offerri oportebat & in aliquibus locis, & per aliquos homines.*

† *Briffon. de Form.* p. 124, 125.

\* *Numb. xix.*



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 163

every Religion hath its Ritual, or Pontifical Observations not to be omitted, or transgressed.

The end which I have assigned of Sacrifices, or Oblations in general, is to honour, or worship the God, to whom they are offered, and to acknowledge him for God, and Lord. To this purpose also speaks "Thomas Aquinas, Secundum enim, quod sacrificia ordinabantur ad cultum Dei, causa sacrificiorum dupliciter accipi potest, &c. For as Sacrifices were appointed for the Worship of God, the Cause of them may be conceived two ways. In one, as we conceive, that the disposition of the Offerers Mind towards God was represented by them. But this is requisite to the right disposition of a Man's Mind towards God, that he acknowledge that all that he hath comes from God, as the first Principle, and ought to be referred to him, as the ultimate End. And both these were set forth in Oblations, and Sacrifices, because a Man was understood to offer those things by way of acknowledgment to God, from whom he had them. According to what David speaks 1 Chron. 29. All things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee. And therefore in offering Sacrifices a Man protested, that God was the first Principle of all Things, and the ultimate End to which all things ought to be referr'd. And because it belongs to the right disposition of a Man's Mind towards God, that he acknowledge no other but God to be the first Cause of all Things, and the ultimate End to which they are to be referr'd, and had no other End but him: Therefore in the Law it was forbid to offer Sacrifice to any other, but to God, according to what is written, Exod. xxii. 20. He that sacrificeth to any God save unto the " LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed.

This shews that the common End of all Sacrifices

---

" L. 2. c. 11. Art. 3.

" In the Original, Except unto JEHOVAH.

## 164 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

was to honour, and worship, and do homage to the God, to whom they were offer'd, and acknowledge him to be *Lord*, as <sup>x</sup> *Briffon* also shews at large out of humane Authors. And indeed the bare *Act of Offering* in it self without speaking a Word, is an Act of religious Homage, and of Honour, Worship, and Recognition of the God, to whom the Offering is made. And therefore to Honour, Worship, and recognize *JEHOVAH* as the only true God, and supreme Lord, being if not the only, yet the <sup>y</sup> chief End of *Burnt-offerings*, the *Jews* permitted the *Gentiles* to bring, or send such Offerings, but of no other sort, to be offered unto God.

Having now explained the Terms used in my Definitions of Sacrifice or Oblation in *general*, I hope the difficulties above-mentioned being considered, they may pass for sufficient Definitions. I believe there are as good as many hundred Definitions among the *School-men* and Writers of *Civil Law*, among whom, considering how hard it is to find proper terms to define many Notions in, they are fain to excuse themselves by that common saying in the <sup>z</sup> Margin, which shews how difficult and nice things general Definitions are, and that allowances ought to be made for them in many cases upon that account. Wherefore if mine are sufficient Definitions of Sacrifice in general, they must comprehend all sorts of Sacrifices howsoever distinguished in sacred or profane Writers, especially in the sacred Code: *voluntary or commanded; animate or inanimate*, the Oblation of the *Levites* in <sup>a</sup> *Numb. viii.* not excepted;

<sup>x</sup> De Formulis, lib. 1. p. 33, 34.

<sup>y</sup> Thomas Aquinas, 1. 2. c. 11. Art. 3. *Holocaustum offerre aliter ad Reverentiam Majestatis ipsius—Et ideo totum comburebatur, ut sicut totum Animal resolutum in vaporem, sursum ascendebat, ita etiam significaretur totum hominum & omnia quæ ipsius sunt, Dei Dominio esse subiecta, & ei esse offerenda.—Totum comburebatur in Honorem Dei, & nihil ex eo comedebatur.*

<sup>z</sup> Definitiones rerum sunt omnium periculosissima.

<sup>a</sup> V. 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16.

consumed

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 165

consumed in whole, or in part upon the Altar, or not to be so consumed; publick or private; daily, weekly, monthly, or anniversary Sacrifices; principal or annexed, more holy, or less holy Sacrifices; Burnt-offerings, Sin-offerings, Trespass-offerings, and Peace-offerings, and that which succeeded in the room of them all under the New-Testament, the propitiatory Oblation of the Eucharist as treated of in the learned and judicious Discourse, whose Title is set down in the Margin. Nay I do not doubt, but it is fairly applicable to the grand expiatory Sacrifice upon the Altar of the Cross; the Sacrifice of our Lord, of which the Legal Sacrifices were Types, and the Eucharistical a representative Commemoration, as I have proved by many Testimonies: For he being a Priest after the Order and Similitude of Melchisedech, there was a necessity that he should have something also to offer, which was the Sacrifice of himself, that one Sacrifice for Sin, the one Offering which he offered but once, and by which he hath perfectly cleansed us from the guilt of Sin. And as there was a necessity that he should have something to offer, so there was a necessity that he should have something to offer himself upon, which by the determinate Council of God, was the Cross; and therefore I make no difficulty to call it an Altar, being the appointed Fabrick or Place upon which ( $\epsilon\phi'$   $\tau\epsilon$ , as *Julius Pollux* speaks) he was to offer himself an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling Savour.

But, *Sir*, there yet remains another Objection to be answered, taken also from the Opinion of another of our learned Divines, *Dr. Cudworth*, who in a Discourse concerning the true Notion of the Lord's

---

<sup>b</sup> The Propitiatory Oblation in the Holy Eucharist, truly stated, and defended, from Scripture, Antiquity, and the Communion-Service of the Church of England, in which some notice is taken of *Dr. Hancock's* Answer to *Dr. Hickey*. London printed 1710.

## 166 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Supper, asserts, ' that it is not a *Sacrifice*, but *Epulum ex oblatis*, a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*, or in other Words, not *Oblatio Sacrificii*, but as *Tertullian* excellently speaks, (saith he) *Participatio Sacrificii*, not the offering of something up to God upon an *Altar*, but the eating of something, which comes from God's *Altar*, and is set up on our *Tables*. And then in contradiction to all *Antiquity*, he asserts, that the *Notion* of a *Sacrament's* being a *Sacrifice* is <sup>a</sup> a *Mistake* for what is the true *Notion* of its being a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*, and that it grew up by the *Degeneration* of this *Truth*, as he expresseth himself; adding, *There is a Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper symbolically, but not as there offered up to God, but feasted on by us, and so not a Sacrifice, but a sacrificial Feast, which began too soon to be misunderstood.* In another place he expresseth himself in this manner: <sup>c</sup> *The eating of Sacrifices was a due and proper Appendix unto all Sacrifices one way or other, either by the Priests, (whom he owns to be the Owners Mediators, unto God, and as their Proxies) or by themselves, when the Person that offered was capable thereof; that is, when he had no Uncleanness upon him, and was perfectly reconciled to God, as he also expresseth himself.* In a Word, from *Analogy* to this ancient *Rite* of feasting upon things sacrificed, and eating of those things in *Person*, or *Proxy*, which they had offered up to God, he takes his new *Notion* of the *Lord's Supper* being a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*, and not a *Sacrifice* it self. To this purpose he speaks in another place: <sup>e</sup> *The very Concinnity, and Harmony of the thing it self leads me to conceive, that the Christian Feast under the Gospel called the Lord's Supper is the very same thing, and bears the same Notion in respect of the true Christian Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, that those did to the*

<sup>c</sup> Chap. 5. p. 54, 55.

<sup>e</sup> Chap. 1. p. 5.

<sup>d</sup> P. 56.

<sup>f</sup> P. 15.



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 167

*Jewish and Heathenish Sacrifices, and so is Epulum Sacrificiale, a sacrificial Feast, I mean a Feast upon Sacrifice, or Epulum ex oblatis, a Feast upon things offered up to God. Only this difference arising in the Parallel, that because those legal Sacrifices were but Types and Shadows of the true Christian Sacrifice, they were often repeated and renewed, as well as the Feasts which were made upon them; but now the true Christian Sacrifice being come, and offered up once for all, never to be repeated, we have therefore no more typical Sacrifices left among us, but only the Feast upon the true Sacrifice still symbolically continued, and often repeated in reference to THAT ONE GREAT SACRIFICE, which is always as present in God's sight, and efficacious, as if it were but now offered for us.*

Now, Sir, in Answer to the Objection taken from this learned Man's new Notion of the Lord's Supper, it will be convenient to distinguish in this sacrificial Feast of Christians between the *Matter*, or *Entertainment* of it, and the *Eating* and *Participation* thereof in the holy Feast, that it may appear in what this Opinion agrees, and how it differs from the ancient, and common Notion, which the Church had of it in the primitive, and purest Times. *First*, then, as to the matter of it, the *Bread and Wine*; it must be granted, that by Christ's own Institution, they are *Symbols* of his Natural Body and Blood, and by his Appointment are to be deemed, reputed, and received as his natural Flesh and Blood, in the Holy Feast. And, *Secondly*, it must be granted, that the Participation of them is a foederal Rite, and hath all the moral Effects between God, and the faithful Communicants, as if they did eat and drink of his natural Body and Blood, which was sacrificed for us upon the Cross. Those moral Effects, are the solemn and comfortable Commemoration of his All-sufficient Sacrifice upon the Cross, and representing it before God on Earth, as

## 168 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

he represents it before him in Heaven, together with a Confirmation and Ratification of the Covenant between God and the Communicants; and the Signification and Assurance of God's Pardon; and of Peace, Reconciliation, and Fellowship between God and the worthy Partakers, who eat and drink the mystical and vicarious Body and Blood of Christ; according to what \* *St. Ignatius* said of the Hereticks, who asserted, that Christ was not a real Man, but only in appearance: *They abstain, (saith he) from the Eucharist, and [the Eucharistical Office of] Prayer, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for our Sins, and which the Father of his Goodness raised again.* The true Sense of which Passage is explained by *Tertullian*, in the xl Chapter of his Book against *Marcion*, to which I refer you. *Thirdly*, It must be acknowledged, that the one great Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross is the only true and proper Sacrifice of the Christian Religion, as by *one* true Sacrifice is understood the one great Sacrifice of propitiation for Sin, which was the Truth and Completion of all the typical Sacrifices; but then his Opinion, that there is no other *external material Oblation* in the Christian Religion, *no offering at God's*

---

\* *Epist. ad Smyrn. VII. εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχοντες*. Multa, & gravia peccat ad hunc locum oppugnator epistolarum nostrarum. 1. Perperam accipit vocem προσευχῆς latissimo modo pro omni prorsus oratione: Cum Ignatius aut loquatur de prece mysticâ, aut Oratione solenni, qua corpus Christi conficitur. Hieronym. *Epist. 85. & ad Sophronia 3. August. III. de Trinitate 4. Eὐχὴ* appellatur à Justino Mart. *Apol. 2. & Origine tum VIII. in Celsum, tum ad Matth. xv. 17. προσευχῆ* ab Augustino *Epist. 59. Aut potius intelligi preces liturgicas juxta constitutiones Apostolicas, Lib. II. Cap. 34. Cyrillum Hierosolym. Catechesi Mystag. 3. & Zonaram ad Canonem Apostoli. 2. & Neocasariensem 13. Sacrificiorum orationes in Tertulliano lib. de oratione extremo: in oratione quando offerimus sacrificia Deo. Epiphanius Johanni Hierosolymitano. Restat itaque allegatio Theodoriti Dialogo 3. Sed ex sensu magis, quam ad verbum, εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχοντες. Corelerius.*

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 169

*Altar, but only eating something that comes from it; and that the mystical or sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, of which we partake at the Lord's Table, are not there offered up unto God, if there were no other Reason, is to be rejected, as of no Authority; because it is New, and contrary to the consentient Belief and Practice of all Churches for above fifteen hundred Years. Of what weight, Sir, can the Opinion of a modern single Man, tho' never so learned, be, if put into the Scale against such a Tradition? But why do I say against such a Tradition? when it is of no weight against the single Testimony of St. Clement, who in his Epistle to the Corinthians, as I have often observed, <sup>h</sup> calls the Ministers of the Church Προσέτακτοι τὰ δῶρα, Offerers of Gifts, or Sacrifices: as it was said by our Lord, if thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembrest, that thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy Gift, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift. In the same Epistle, as I have also noted, he exhorts the Corinthians, to perform their Oblations, and publick Ministrations at the appointed times. This Holy Apostolical Author laboured in the Gospel with St. Paul, and it is no Reflection to say, that he understood the Apostles Writings, and the Mind of God in them, better than Dr. Cudworth, or your late Writer. And, Sir, I dare appeal to you, or any other Divine, who is as well versed in the Fathers, and Councils, as you, which of the Two it is most reasonable to believe. Indeed, Sir, I cannot but think if Dr. Cudworth had been as well acquainted with the ancient Christian Writers, as he was with the Rabinnical and Platonick, and as well skilled in the primitive Customs, and Practices of the Church, as in other Theories, that*

---

<sup>h</sup> See Bishop Fell's learned Notes on the Place.

<sup>i</sup> Τὸ δῶρον &c.

## 170 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

he would not have vented an Opinion, which, to repeat but one Instance more, is a perfect Contradiction to *Justin Martyr's* Description of the Holy *Eucharist*, as administred in those early Times, and if these holy Mens Notion, and Description of it; as a Sacrifice be, as he affirms, a Mistake, it is as ancient as the time of the Apostles, and stood uncorrected, for almost sixteen hundred Years. I cannot also but believe that *St. Clement* in particular understood the x<sup>th</sup> Chapter of *1 Cor.* and the Parallel which the Apostle there makes, between Jewish and Gentile Sacrifices, and the Lord's Supper, where the very Analogy requires that the Bread and Wine with which we are entertained at the Lord's Table, must be as he calls it, an Oblation, and the Priest who administers, the Offerer thereof. This I could not but observe again, because he turns the Apostle's Parallel to another meaning, <sup>k</sup> making the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, and not the *Offering of Bread and Wine*, (which, contrary to *Fact*, he asserts was not offered at the Lord's Supper) to be the only Sacrifice of which the Christians were Partakers at the Lord's Table. But I may challenge him, and all the World, to shew me, that any Priests or People, of what Religion soever, ever feasted of any Sacrifices, which they did not offer before; and therefore he granting that the Lord's Supper was a Feast upon a Sacrifice, it was a Singularity of his own, without any Coninnity to the Nature of sacrificial Feasts, or the Practice of eating of them, to assert, against *Fact*, that the mystical Body and Blood of Christ, of which we are Partakers at the Lord's Table, were not first solemnly offered up.

To confirm his Opinion, he asserts, that we have no Altar to offer upon: <sup>l</sup> It was, *never known*,

---

<sup>k</sup> P. 52, 53, 54, 70.

<sup>l</sup> Ch. 5. P. 55.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 171

saith he, among the Jews, or Heathens, that the Tables, upon which they eat their Sacrifices, were called Altars. But I have shew'd at large before, that holy Tables in the Heathen Temples were used as Altars, especially in Meat and Drink-Offerings; and therefore it is no wonder that the Christians called the Lord's Table an Altar, which they used as an Altar in offering up the Bread, and Wine upon it, it being very common for things to have several Names, according to the several Uses in which they are employ'd. Thus he himself grants, that the Altar at Jerusalem was a Table, and so called, because it was a Table upon which God himself did eat in consuming the <sup>m</sup> Sacrifices with his holy Fire. And if that Altar was a Table, and is so called, not in Scripture only, but by the <sup>n</sup> Talmudical Writers, because the Sacrifices were eaten upon it; why should not the <sup>o</sup> holy Table of the Lord be called an Altar, because the Meat, and Drink of the holy Feast are solemnly offered upon it, before the Priest and People participate thereof. He farther saith, That St. Paul speaking of the Feasts upon Idol Sacrifices, calls the Places on which they were eaten the Tables of Devils, because the Devil's Meat was eaten upon them; not the Altars of Devils, and yet doubtless, saith he, he spake according to the true propriety of Speech, and in those technical Words which were then in use among them, and therefore keeping the same Analogy, he must needs call the Communion Table by the Name of the Lord's Table; the Table upon which God's Meat is eaten, not his Altar, upon which it is offered. To which I

---

<sup>m</sup> Therefore the Sacrifices which God so eat in whole, or in part, are called his Meat, *Malachi* i. 12. and his Bread, i. e. his Food, *Isaiah* xlv. 7. *Levit.* iii. 11. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22. xxii. 25.

<sup>n</sup> *Joh. Lightfoot*, in 1 *Cor.* xi. 21.

<sup>o</sup> As it was indifferently called by both Names in the ancient Catholick Church, and is called by both in the Rubrick of the Holy Communion of the first Liturgy of K. Edward VI.

answer,

## 172 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

answer, that St. Paul spake indeed properly, when he called the Places upon which the Idol Sacrifices were eaten the *Tables of Devils*, and with the same Propriety he called the Place upon which the Bread of God was eaten the *Lord's Table*; but then as the Prophets *Ezekiel*, and *Malachi* calling the *Jerusalem-Altar* the *Table of the Lord*, did not imply that it was not an Altar: So the Apostles calling the Place, upon which the Bread of God was eaten in the Christian Temples, the *Lord's Table*, did not imply that it was not an Altar, upon which it was offered, before it was eaten, and consumed. He owns it was *God's Meat*, that was eaten upon it; and, I profess, I cannot well understand, how the *Materials* of that holy Feast came to be *God's Meat*, without being first offered unto Him, and thereby made his Meat in the most special sense, as St. *Ignatius* calls the Eucharistical Bread, the *Bread of God*, not in the common sense, as all Bread is, but as all material Things by being offered to him, became his. He talks much of *Analogy*, and *Concinnity*, and if that must be the Rule, by which to judge in this late Controversie, which was none for sixteen hundred Years; then I am sure, whether we consider the sacrificial Feasts of Jews, or Gentiles, it will prove, that the external *Materials* of the holy Christian Communion must be a Sacrifice, or Oblation, before they could be a sacrificial Feast. Wherefore the Primitive Christians, as I must often inculcate, solemnly offered up the Bread, and Wine upon the *Lord's Table*, and as in offering them up, they used it as an Altar, so they esteemed, and called it an Altar, as I have shew'd St. Paul did in saying *we have an Altar*, that is, *we have an Altar-Offering, of which they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle*. Wherefore not to recite the Testimonies of St. *Ignatius*, and other Writers, who so often call the *Lord's Table*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 173

*Table an Altar*, and many others, which might <sup>p</sup> be brought, the Holy Eucharist is an Altar-Offering, before it is the Lord's Supper, and the holy Table, like the Altar at *Hierusalem*, is used in every Communion as an Altar for Sacrifice, before it is employed, as a Table for the sacrificial Feast. *S. Hierom*, in the forecited place, calls it by both Names; *we pollute*, saith he, the Bread of God, *i. e.* the Body of Christ, when we come unworthily to the Altar, and we declare the Table of the Lord to be contemptible, when being impure we drink his pure Blood; I must farther observe, that *Dr. Cudworth* hath not one Testimony, divine, or human, for his new Opinion, *Participatio Sacrificii*, which he cites with an eulogy out of *Tertullian*, being to be understood of the Participation of the Bread, and Wine offered as Sacrifice upon the Lord's Table, as is plain from the place cited in the <sup>a</sup> Margin, and from many others, collected out of his other Tracts by *Rigaltius* in his

---

<sup>p</sup> As that in *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. x. cap. 4. versus finem*, in his Description of all the Parts of the Altar, *Σευρόν δ' ἡ ψῆσα, ἡ μωροσπὴς διωταρχεον, &c.* But the august, great, and one Altar, what can it signify but the most pure, and most holy Soul of the common Priest of all: at whose right Hand stands the great High-Priest of the whole World, Jesus himself the only begotten Son of God, who hath a cheerful Look, and Hands stretched out receiveth from all that sweet-smelling Incense, and unbloody, and immaterial Sacrifices by Prayers, and transmits them to his heavenly Father, the Supreme God.

<sup>a</sup> *Qua oratio cum divortio sancti osculi integra, quem Domino officio facientem impedit pax? Quale Sacrificium est, a quo sine pace receditur? — Similiter & stationum diebus non putant plerique Sacrificiorum Orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit, sic accepto Corpore Domini, ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia dissolvit? An magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua si ad Aram Dei steteris? Accepto Corpore Domini, & reservato, utrumque salvum est, & Participatio Sacrificii, & executio officii.*

first

## 174 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*first* Note upon his Tract of Prayer, some of which I have also put in the <sup>r</sup> Margin.

I could say more to refute this learned Man's Opinion, were it needful, or convenient to enter into a Theory of the Jewish Sacrifices, but I think it is time to dismiss this Cause, and therefore to conclude, as this Notion of the Lord's Supper being only a Feast upon the Sacrifice of Christ, is new, and singular, and as I have shew'd, contrary to Catholick Tradition both in Belief, and Practice : so is it a nice Notion, and of no Use, or Service, that I know of to Religion : *First*, It is a very nice Notion, and vain Imagination, thus to separate the *Table* from the *Altar*, the *Sacrament* from the *Sacrifice*, and the outward Offering of the one, from the federal Feast of the other, in the Lord's Supper. This is to put asunder what God hath joined together, and in effect to declare, that if the Bread, and Wine be first made an Oblation to God, they cannot become the mystical Flesh, and Blood of his Son. *Secondly*, As this is a nice, and new Notion, so is it of no Use, or Service to the Church. On the contrary, it deserves Religion, and is of dangerous Consequence to this Holy Sacrament it self : For by the same Liberty this Author, I am sure, without any ill Intention, hath taken away the solemn Offering of the Bread, and Wine, from the holy Mystery, others, after his Example, have presumed to take away the solemn Consecration of them, and so have reduced it, in their blasphemous Language, to nothing but a *Health*. So dangerous it is for learned, though never so good Men, to remove the old Land-Marks, and advance new Notions destructive, or

---

\* Oblationes reddere, offerre, & commemorare per Sacerdotem ; Sacrificium offerri ; offers calicem ; ne prius ascendamus ad altare quo modo audebit orationem dicere ad Altare ; celebrat, & panis oblationem.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 175

tending to the Destruction of the old. I believe this Author might really intend by this Notion to secure the Holy Eucharist from the Popish Notion of it; for if it is not a real Sacrifice at all, most certainly it cannot be such a Sacrifice, as the Papal Church defines it to be, to wit, *a proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living, and the Dead, in which the Body, and Blood of Christ with his Soul, and Divine Nature is in Truth, Reality, and Substance, offered up for the Living, and the Dead, the whole Substance of the Bread being converted into the Body, and the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ.* But this is running from one Extreme to the other without any Reason, because the ancient Notion of this Holy Sacrament's being a commemorative Sacrifice, in which we *represent* before God, the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, perfectly secures the holy Mystery from that corrupt and absurd Notion, it being impossible, that a solemn Commemoration of a Fact, or Thing, should be the Fact, or Thing it self; or to speak otherwise, with respect to the holy Symbols, by which we make the Commemoration, that what represents should be the thing represented; the Figure the Verity it self, or the Sign that which is signified thereby.

Sir, I have said all this in Defence of the *old*, against the Doctor's *new* Notion of the Holy Eucharist, much more out of Love to that old Truth, than to prove Christian Ministers to be proper Priests. For as it will follow from *that*, that they are in the literal Sense Θύοι, *true sacrificing Priests*, as 'Greg. Nazian. calls Bishops: so will it follow even from *this*, that they must be *proper Priests*, because, as none but a Priest can offer a Sacrifice, so none but a Priest can preside, and minister in such a *sacrificial Feast* as, he

---

<sup>c</sup> GAL. xxxii. 'Οὐδὲ θύτας καθαρὲς, ἀλλὰ περσάτας ἰχθυὲς ζήσων.

## 176 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

allows the Holy Sacrament to be. Who but a Priest can receive the Elements from the People, set them upon the holy Table, and offer up to God such solemn Prayers, Praises, and Thanksgivings, for the Congregation, and make such solemn Intercessions for them, as are now, and ever were offered, and made in this Holy Sacrament? Who but a Priest can consecrate the Elements by solemn Prayer, and make them the mystical Body, and Blood of Christ? Who but a Priest can stand in God's stead at his Table, and in his Name receive his Guests? Who but a Priest hath Power to break the Bread, and bless the Cup, and make a solemn Memorial before God of his Son's Sufferings, and then deliver his sacramental Body, and Blood to the faithful Communicants, as Tokens of his meritorious Sufferings, and Pledges of their Salvation? A Man *authorized* thus, to act for Men in things pertaining to God, and for God in things pertaining to Men, must needs be a Priest, and such holy Ministrations must needs be sacerdotal, whether the holy Table be an Altar, and the Sacrament a Sacrifice, or not. This *Sir*, I have proved, and therefore now shall content my self only to say so much upon the Subject of Priesthood, as is sufficient to put you in remembrance of what I said before.

Having now, *Sir*, got over the Objections, taken from the Writings of these two learned Men against the Eucharist's being a Sacrifice, I desire your *late Writer*, and such Gentlemen, as he, who have been led into their Errors by these, and other Writers since the Reformation, to consider, that if the Holy Eucharist be a *Sacrifice*, as the Catholick Church believed ' in all Ages before that time, how far the defect,

---

\* Vincent. Lirin. Cap. III. *In ipsa Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc est enim vere proprieque Catholicum, Cap. XXXVIII. Hoc facere magnopere curabunt, ut divinum canonem secundum uni-*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 177

defect, in administring of it only as a *Sacrament*, may affect the holy Office, and the Ministrations of it; and whether the Communion administred by a Priest, who neither believes himself to be such, nor the Sacrament to be an Oblation, or *Sacrifice*, can be a Communion, in, or with the Catholick Church? I say, I leave it to themselves to consider these things, and, I think, they deserve their Consideration, and hope they will seriously, and impartially ruminate upon them, least they should *not rightly, and duly administer* that H. Sacrament. "The best of the Jewish Writers tells us, that it was a Profanation of a Sacrifice, if the Priest thought, when he offered up one Sacrifice, that it was another; as if when he offered a *Burnt-Offering*, he thought it was a *Peace-Offering*; or if when he offered a *Peace-Offering*, he thought it was a *Burnt-Offering*. Whether that obliquity of Thought, when it happened, had such an effect or no, I shall not now enquire; but this I dare say, if a Jewish Priest, who did not believe himself to be a proper Priest, nor the Jewish Altar a proper Altar, nor the Sacrifices of the Law true, and proper Sacrifices, had presumed to offer while he was in this unhappy Error, that he had profaned the Sacrifice, as far as he was concerned in it, and not offered it

---

*versalis Ecclesie Traditiones, & juxta Catholici dogmatis regulas interpretentur. In qua etiam Catholica Apostolicaque Ecclesia sequantur necesse est Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem. Et si quando pars contra Universitatem, novitas contra vetustatem, unius, vel paucorum errantium dissentio contra omnium, vel certo multo plurium Catholicorum consensionem rebellaverit, praeferant partis Corruptioni universitatis integritatem, &c. Cap. XXXIX. Quicquid vel omnes, vel plures uno eodemque sensu manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum concilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint, id pro indubitato, certo ratoque habeatur. Cap. XLI. Quicquid uno sensu, atque consensu tenuisse invenientur, id Ecclesia verum & Catholicum absque ullo scrupulo, judicaretur. Sec alio Cap. XLII. p. 140, 141, 142.*

" *Maimonides de Cultu divino, Tract. VII. Cap. XIII. Art. I.*

## 178 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

up *ὁσίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως*, according to the Will of God, though according to all the appointed Rites, nor in Unity of Communion, and Conjunction with the Jewish Church. For the Jewish Church would not have suffered such Priests, if known, to minister among the Sons of *Aaron*, and *Zadok*; nor would the ancient Catholick Church have endured Bishops, and Presbyters without Censure, who durst have taught, that the Christian Ministry was not a proper *Priesthood*, the Holy Eucharist not a proper *Sacrifice*, or that Christian Ministers were not proper Priests.

But to finish this part of my Discourse about the *Holy Eucharist*, and to prevent, as much as in me lies, the sinister Censures, and Constructions, of suspicious, or ill-minded Men, I conclude it with the Words of Dr. *John Forbes* in his *Irenicum*, where he treats of the Lord's Supper.

*The holy Fathers, who used the Words Sacrifice, Priesthood, Altar, Oblation, and Mass, were far from the Error of those Mass-mongers, who blasphemously boast, that they properly, and truly offer unto God Christ himself included under the Species of Bread and Wine, as a truly propitiatory Sacrifice. But nothing of this nature is found among the Fathers.*

To which let me add what he saith by way of Introduction to what he writes of the Lord's Supper, immediately after the Words above cited.

*I will not speak of the Oblation of the Elements, which was made by the People, and how the Pastors taking the Oblations from their Hands, placed them upon the Lord's Table, and with humble Prayers offered them to God, that they might be sanctified, and consecrated into a Sacrament of Salvation to the Communicants. Nor will I mention the Eucharistical Sacrifice of*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 179

*Praise, which the faithful offered to God in the Commemoration of the Death of our Lord, &c.*

Here is as perfect a Description of a Sacrifice, as can be made. *1st.* The People's Offerings in bringing the GIFTS: *2dly*, The Priests receiving them from their Hands, and setting them upon the Lord's Table: *3dly*, His offering them to God by Prayer, to be sanctified into a Sacrament for the People; And, *Lastly*, The Solemnization of the Action with a Sacrifice of Praise, and Thanksgiving, which the People by the Minister's Mouth offered up to God. And if this be not a Description of a most solemn Oblation, or Sacrifice, I must confess I am not able to know what is. It exactly agrees with the *Order of Administration* of the Lord's Supper in the Scottish Liturgy, which was framed according to this Description of the Holy Eucharist, and that of *Justin Martyr*; and I have often wondered, how this Writer came to make such an Introduction to a Discourse, wherein he endeavoured, as much as he could, to prove that the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was only an *improper metonymical* Sacrifice, and the Lord's Table an *Altar* only in a *metaphorical sense*. But in that Discourse he hath more such Inconsistencies; as where he saith, *The third Consideration of a spiritual Sacrifice, and Oblation in the Holy Eucharist, is obvious in the Oblation, by which the faithful did not only offer up to God the Symbols to be consecrated, but themselves also, coming to the Table of the Lord, and there professing themselves to be his Servants, and vowing all holy Obedience to him by right of Redemption, as being redeemed by his Blood.* But were not the Symbols, which the faithful so solemnly offered up to God with themselves, by the Ministration of the Bishop, or Presbyter, an *external material Oblation*? And was not the Table to which they approached, and upon which their Oblations were offered up in most solemn manner, used as an Altar?

G g

and

## 180 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and from that constant use of it, to which it was set apart, did it not, as things are denominated from their use, properly deserve that Name? But indeed this learned Man in that Discourse confounds the Notions of a real, or proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, one with the other, as likewise the Notions of a truly proper, and spiritual Oblation, as if the *Lord's Supper* could not be the one, because it is sometimes called the other.

IX. From hence, *Sir*, I proceed to my last Argument, which I shall produce out of the Writings of the New Testament, to prove Bishops, and Presbyters, but more especially Bishops, to be proper Priests, because they are Ministers of the Archetypal *Melchisedeck* in his Priestly Kingdom upon Earth, who was made Priest with an Oath by his Father, who sware unto him: *Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck*. Being therefore Ministers under him, who is a Priest after the Order, and Similitude of *Melchisedeck*, who was both King, and Priest, they must represent him in his Priestly, as well as his Kingly Capacity, and by consequence be invested by him with Sacerdotal, as well as Regal Power. As his Ministers, or Stewards, or Ambassadors, or Lieutenants in his Kingdom upon Earth, they must be his Vicegerents in all his three Offices, as Priest, Prophet, and King. I believe, *Sir*, your *late Writer* will not deny that they represent him in his prophetic Office, as Prophet is taken for a Teacher, or that by their Office they are proper Prophets, or Teachers, whom he hath appointed to instruct his People in the *Mysteries* of his Kingdom unto the end of the World. For the same reason, unless the unhappy Subject, upon which he writes, oblige him to deny it, I believe he will grant, that they represent him also in his Regal Office, in virtue of which he is supreme Rector, or Governour of his Kingdom; and that as his

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 181

his Vicegerents in it, they are proper Governours of his Church. For what reason then should he deny them to be proper Priests, who represent him, as really in his Priestly, as in his Kingly, and Prophe-tical Offices, and, like the Jewish Priests, are his Vicegerents in that, as truly, and properly as they are in these. To illustrate this Truth as much as I can, let us suppose that the typical *Melchisedeck* the *Sacerdotal King* of *Salem*, like the Lord in the Gospel, had gone a long Journey into a far Coun-try, and had called one of his Subjects unto him, and given him Authority in his Absence to admini-strate his Kingdom for him, with a particular Power to perform all divine Worship duly, and more especially to offer Sacrifice in the appoin-ted times, and place; upon such a Supposition, Sir, I would ask your *late Writer*, whether such a Minister of *Melchisedeck* would not have been his Vicegerent in both Offices, and really invested with the sacerdotal, as well as the regal Power? Would he not have been a Vice High-Priest, as well as a Viceroy? and would not the People of *Salem*, when he pray'd, and sacrificed for them, have look-ed upon him, as a true, and proper, though a de-puted High Priest? Sir, it is not without Ground, that I make this familiar Comparison, because the Antitypal *Melchisedeck* so often compares himself in the Gospel to a Man taking a far Journey, or travelling into a far Country, who leaving his House gave Authority to his Servants, as he did to his Apostles, and their Successors, before he was parted from them, and carried up into Heaven. He committed the Government of his sacerdotal King-dom in whole, and in part, jointly, and sever-ally to them. *As my Father sent me (saith he) e-ven so I send you; And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted,*

## 182 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained, John xx. 21, 22, 23. Or as their Commission is expressed, *Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All Power is given unto me both in Heaven, and Earth. Go ye therefore and make all Nations my Disciples, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, &c. and teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you, and I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World.* This Commission he gave them upon the Mount, when he was ready to ascend, as it is also written, *When he ascended up on high, he led in Triumph a great multitude of Captives, and gave Gifts unto Men,* that some might be Apostles, some Prophets, &c. for perfecting the Body of the Saints, or Christians made up of Jews, and Gentiles, for the Work of the Ministry in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, for the edifying the whole Body of Christ, till we all, both Jews and Gentiles, come in the Unity of the Faith, and Knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect Manhood, unto the full Measure of the Stature of Christ.

Wherefore, *Sir*, this eternal Archetypal and Antitypal *Melchisedeck* going up into the Heaven of Heavens, as it were into a far Country, and leaving his Apostles, and their Successors as his Stewards, and Vicegerents, invested with full Power, and Authority to administrate his Sacerdotal Kingdom, is it not reasonable to believe that their Ministry is truly, and properly Sacerdotal, as well as Regal, and a Communication, or Commission of the Sacerdotal Powers to mediate, and make intercession for the People by Prayers, and Sacrifices, as well as by their Prophetical to teach, or by their <sup>n</sup> Rectoral, or ru-

---

<sup>n</sup> S. Ambros. de dignitate Sacerdotii. *Quas oves, & quem gregem non solum tunc beatus suscepit Petrus, sed & cum illo eos nos suscepimus omnes. Unde regendæ Sacerdotibus contraduntur, merito Rectoribus suis subdicuntur.*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 183

ling Authority, which they derive from him as a Spiritual King, to govern his Kingdom, which in the second place is therefore called a Royal Priesthood, as I have already observed, because like that of the Jews, it is governed by Priests under him the invisible Head °, and High Priest of his Church. St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the *Magnesiensians*, calls God the Father the invisible Bishop, and the Bishop of that Flock their visible Bishop: *Submit*, saith he, *to your young Bishop, or rather not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ the Bishop of us all. It therefore behoves you for his Honour, whose Pleasure it is you should do so, to obey him with all Sincerity, because he that doth not so, deceives not so much the visible Bishop, as he endeavours to put Tricks upon the invisible. But whatsoever is done in this manner, reflects not upon a Man, but God, who knoweth all Secrets.* What I collect from hence is this, That as Jesus Christ is a most proper Bishop over his Church by Commission from his Father, so the visible Bishops are proper Bishops of it, by Mission, or Commission from him. This, I suppose, your *late Writer* will also grant; and if he will, let him give any good reason if he can, why by Mission, or Commission from Christ the High-Priest of our Profession, they are not also proper Priests. The same Saint thought them so, when speaking of Christ in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, under the Character of High-Priest, and of his Ministers as *Priests* by Mission from him: *Honourable* (saith he) *are the Priests, but much more honourable is the High-Priests, to whom<sup>p</sup> the Holy of Holies is committed, and to whose Trust alone are committed the Secrets of God. He is the Door of Entrance to the Father, by which Abraham, and Isaac,*

---

\* Per Christum Jesum Catholicum Patris Sacerdotem. Tertull. Libro III. contra Marcionem, cap. 1.

<sup>p</sup> Heb. ix. 12, 24.

## 184 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and Jacob, and the Prophets, and the Apostles, and the Church enter in, He is also the *Apostle*, as well as *High-Priest* of our Religion, as it is written, *Consider the Apostle, and High-Priest of our Profession, Jesus Christ*, and therefore, as the Apostles whom he sent, as his Father sent him, were, truly, and properly speaking, Apostles under him ; so under him, truly, and properly speaking, were they also Priests. As he is a Priest, and his Kingdom is a Sacerdotal Kingdom : So his Ministers must be Priests, or Sacerdotal Ministers, as well as Ministers to govern, and teach his People.

To prove which yet more abundantly, let us enquire what it was, in which the Exercise of the Priest's Office did in the former Ages of the Church more eminently, and more especially consist. But before I enter on this Enquiry, I must observe, that as God was always pleased in some measure to limit the Holy Priesthood, *first* to Princes of Tribes, and Fathers, or elder Sons of Families, *then* to a separate Tribe, and *last* of all to a separate Order of Men : So he was not tied up to his own Rules, but thought fit sometimes to give extraordinary Commissions to other Men, to execute the Sacerdotal Office upon particular Occasions. For as in all Kingdoms where there are publick Ministers of Justice, as the *Twelve Judges* in this, whose Office it is, as a separate Order of Men in *Civils* to do Justice, and Judgment to the People, the Sovereign sometimes grants private Persons Commissions upon extraordinary Occasions to hear, and determine Causes : So in the Patriarchal and Jewish times God now and then empowered, and commanded Persons, who were not Priests to do Priestly Acts, as he was pleased to move *Baalam*, the *Chaldaean* Diviner, whom he over-ruled by his own Spirit, to build Altars, and sacrifice to himself, as *Balaak* again and again urged him

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 185

him to do. Thus *Gideon* by God's Direction built an Altar, and sacrificed upon it, *Judges* vi. Thus also <sup>1</sup> *Manoah*, the Father of *Sampson*, offered a Burnt-offering, and Meat-offering unto God by the direction of an Angel, whom they took for a Prophet sent from God. For when *Manoah* and his Wife saw that Angel ascend up to Heaven in the Flame of the Altar, they fell on their Faces to the Ground, and *Manoah* said unto her, we shall surely die, because we have seen God. Such extraordinary Commissions as these to execute the Priest's Office by those who were not Priests the Hebrews call *The Law of an Hour*, because they lasted no longer than the time, or occasion, for which they were given. So Prophets by special Command, or prophetic Inspiration from God, often sacrificed, and prayed, as others also did by special Direction from them: Thus King *David* built an Altar in the Threshing-floor of *Araunah* by the direction of the Prophet *Gad*, and offered Burnt-offerings, and Peace-offerings, so that *the Lord was entreated for the Land, and the Plague was stayed from Israel*. So King *Solomon* who was a Prophet, and as a Prophet had secret intercourse with God, who <sup>2</sup> appeared several times to him in Dreams, dedicated the Temple, and hallowed the Court, and kneeling before the Altar blessed the People, and made Supplication for them. But other Kings, who were not Prophets, and had no such prophetic Directions, or Commands as *David*, and *Solomon* had, could not execute any part of the Priest's Office without Sacrilege, nor could they presume to do it without Sin at any other times, but when they were authorized by God. Of this we have two remarkable Examples, one of King *Saul*, <sup>1</sup> *Sam.* xiii. who having not patience to stay till *Samuel* the Priest came,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Judges* xiii.

<sup>2</sup> *1 Kings* ix. 2.

## 186 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

presumed to sacrifice, and make Supplication to the Lord, by which Transgression he provoked God, to seek out another Man after his own Heart, to be King. The other is of King *Uzziah*, 2 *Chron.* xxvi. who presumed to go into the Temple of the Lord, and offer Incense upon the Altar; but while he held the Censer in his Hand, the High Priests, and the Priests withstood him, and told him, it did not belong to him to burn Incense upon the Altar, but to the Priests the Sons of *Aaron*, who were consecrated to burn Incense; and while they spoke thus, the Leprosy rose in his Forehead in the House of the Lord, for which they thrust him out thence, and continuing a Leper to the Day of his Death, he was cut off from the House of the Lord, so that the Kingdom was administered by *Jotham* his Son.

XI. Having premised this, I proceed to enquire what it is, in which the Exercise of the Priest's Office doth more eminently consist, to prove more abundantly thereby that Christian Ministers are *proper Priests*. I have in part shewed before, that one of the most noble, divine, and proper Acts of the Priest's Office, is to <sup>f</sup> *mediate*, and make Intercessions

---

<sup>f</sup> *Claud. Espencæus de Mediatore, ac Redemptore, &c. Cap. i. Christus solus verus, ac perfectus Mediator. Nihil tamen prohibet mediatores tum angelos, tum homines suo quoque modo &c esse, &c dici, quatenus ad hominum salutem, hoc est cum Deo unionem Deo, &c Mediatori cooperantur, &c ministrant. Illos — Hos autem utriusque testamenti Ministros, veteris quidem, quod verum Mediatorem figurant &c prænunciant: novi autem, quatenus ejusdem Christi salutaria ipsius tum verba, tum Sacramenta hominibus exhibent, atque dispensant. Si sic aiebat Moses fuisse se, ac stetisse sequestrum, ac medium inter Deum, &c Israel, &c. Quid multa Prophetarum Apostolorumque singuli Mediatores fuerunt. Sic ad Fabiolam de veste sacerdotali Hieron. &c ad Malach. Cap. ii. Pontifices, Episcopos, Sacerdotes Dei, & hominum sequestres — Theophylactus ad Joh. Cap. iii. — Chrysost. homil. de verbis Isaia. Lib. VI. de Sacerdotio. Ambrosius Orat. prioris preparatoria ad missam. Nazianzenus in Apologetico, &c monodia in Basilium: Nec dubito quin plerique alii, qui nunc non occurrunt non verentur*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 187

sions for the People. And when I have shewed this more fully, and that it is part of the Office of Christian *Liturgs*, or Ministers to be *Mediators*, and Intercessors with God; then I hope your *late Writer* will see Reason enough to think as you and I do, that they are *proper Priests*.

As to the *first*, he cannot doubt of it; but however, because it is a Truth, which is now turned into ridicule among us, and by the sinful Silence of our Priests upon this Subject is not understood by some, and worn out of the Minds of others, I think I shall do God, and his Church Service, by shewing from the Consent of all Nations, and the common Notion, and Belief of all Mankind, who were not perfectly barbarous; that Priests by their Office were ever taken to be *Mediators*, and Advocates, or Intercessors with the God, whose Priests they were. This I shall shew with as much Brevity, as I can from the agreeing Practice of Heathens, and of the Church of God under the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations; among whom the Priests ever acted, and were ever esteemed, as Mediators between God, and Men.

I shall give but two Examples, tho' I might give

---

*tur, Sacerdotes appellare pro Universo terrarum orbe, Deique & hominum, seu inter hos & illum Mediatores, medios, sequestres, legatos, deprecatores, intercessores.* I desire the Reader to observe, that *Espeñcaus* here speaks of Angels, as Mediators for Men with God, according to the corrupt Doctrines, and Practice of the Roman Church, in praying unto Angels. So in *St. Hierom adversus Luciferianos*. *Sacerdos quippe pro Laico offert oblationem suam, imponit manum subjeſto, reditum S. Spiritus invocat, atque ita eum, qui traditus fuerat Satanae in interitum carnis, ut Spiritus saluus fieret, indit in populum oratione, altari reconciliat.* So on *Malachi ii. 7.* *Exponit nomen suum Esdras Sacerdos Dei: hoc est Malachia, quod Angelus Dei interpretatur. Angelus autem, id est, Nuncius, Sacerdos Dei verissime dicitur, quia Dei & hominum sequester est, ejusque ad populum nunciat voluntatem, & idcirco in Sacerdotis pectore rationale — ut dicamus Sacerdotem doctum esse debere, & praeconem Dominicae veritatis.*

more

## 188 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

more from heathen Authors. The first is that of the *Persian Priests*, who at their Sacrifices put up Prayers not only for themselves, but for *all the Persians*, and especially for *the King*. The second is that of *Apollo's Priest* in the First Book of *Homer's Iliads*. The Story in short, you know, Sir, is this, The *Gracians* among other Captives had carried away the Daughter of *Chryses* the Priest of *Apollo*, whom King *Agamemnon* took for his Prey, as the Custom of War was in ancient times, according to the Song of *Deborah*, and *Barak*, *Have they not divided the Prey, to every Man a Damsel or two?* Upon this, the Priest arrayed in all his Pontificals, and holding a golden Scepter, the Ensign of his God, in his Hand, goes to the *Gracian* Camp, supplicating, and offering Ransom for his Daughter. But *K. Agamemnon* treated him very roughly, and without any Respect shewed to his Character, sent him away without her. *Chryses* upon the Repulse, and Affronts he received, prayed to his God to revenge him on the *Gracians*, upon which *Apollo* shot his *Arrows* of Pestilence among them, which first brought a Murrain among their Cattel, and then a grievous Mortality among the Men. This obliged them to consult *Kalchas* the Augur, to know what was the Cause of *Apollo's* Anger, who upon Security, and Protection promised by *Achilles*, told them, it was not for any want of Supplication, or Sacrifice, that his Deity was angry at them, but that he was provoked by King *Agamemnon's* ill Usage of his Priest, and refusing

---

\* Herodot. Lib. I. CXXXII. p. 37.

\* Τίσιαν Δακρυοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα. Κοῖσι βέλγων. Ἐκλαζαν δ' ἄρ' οἷοι ἐπ' ἄμυν χλωμένοισι. Μετὰ δ' ἰδὼν ἔπλε. Δεινὸν κλαυσὴν γένετ' ἀεὶ στυγέοντο βίον. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτοῖσι βέλγε' ἔχετο δακρυὸς ἀφίει. Βαλλ'. Τῶνεν' ἄρ' ἀλγὲ' ἔδωκεν ἐναβόλῃ. So Psalm xci. 5. Οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ὑπὸ φόβῳ νυκτερινῷ, ὅτε βέλγεσσι σοὶ μέμνηται ἡμέρας. Sept. Οὐδὲ μεμνημένοι πλάτρου ροίζησιν οἷον.

Apoligar. Interpret. Psalm.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 189

to restore his Daughter, and farther assured them, that the Plague would not stop till they had freely restored to *Chryses* his Daughter, and sent him an Hecatomb to offer to his God. With great Unwillingness, and Difficulty, King *Agamemnon* was brought to part with his beloved Captive *Chryseis*, for so was she called; but at last his Majesty sent her back very honourably to her Father, with an Hecatomb for *Apollo*, "to pacify his Wrath, both which *Ulysses* with all Respect, and humble Language presented to the Priest. Having received his Daughter with great Joy, he proceeded to offer the Sacrifice, which the *Gracians* sent to *Apollo*, whose Deputies joined their *Pœans* of Praise with his Intercessions, and so the Plague was stayed in the *Gracian* Camp.

Sir, one cannot but observe here how *Homer* Hebraizes, and how the Plague is described by him to have been stayed by the Mediation of *Chryses*, from wasting the *Gracian* Army, as that which arose in the Congregation of *Israel* upon the Rebellion of *Korah*, was stayed by the Atonement which \* *Aaron* made, after it had destroyed fourteen thousand, and seven hundred Men. This brings to my remembrance, that Passage of our learned Country-man *Alcuin*, proper to this Subject, in his Epistle to his Scholar *Eanbald*, when he was Archbishop of *York*. Ut omnia fiant acceptabilia Domino Deo, qui te elegit sibi Sacerdotem, &c. That all things (saith

\* — Φοίβῳ δ' ἵερπλ' ἐκατόμβην πέσαι ἕρποντα Δαναῶν, ὅρ' ἱλασάμεθ' ἄνακτα.

\* St. Ambrose in *Hebr.* cap. vii. Tanta quippe Sacerdotii excellentia, ut etiam qui similis essent honoris progenitoribus, & eundem haberent progenitorem, tamen ut multo amplius meliores essent fratribus suis, quo Sacerdotio digni efficerentur, velut *Aaron* inter vivos, & mortuos, ut iram Dei placaret, quæ exarserat, stare legitur: Quod propterea unus ex populo facere poterat (licet omnes unum haberent progenitorem) quod Sacerdos esset.

## 190 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

he) may be acceptable to the Lord God, who hath chosen thee to be his Priest. For every High Priest taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God. Aaron stood with the Censer of his Office between the Living, and the Dead, that the Anger of God should not burn longer against the People. For the Priest of God, ought to be the Preacher of his Will to the People, and an Intercessor for the People to God, as a Mediator between God, and Men. So saith St. Ambrose, in *Epist. ad Hebr. cap. v.* Pontificis officium est inter Deum stare, & populum, & Deum precari pro populi delictis. Hoc enim Christus fecit, seipsum offerens pro peccatis nostris, semper vivus ad interpellandum pro nobis: *It is the Office of a Priest to stand between God, and the People, and to pray unto him for the Forgiveness of their Sins, which Christ did, who ever lives to make Intercession for us, when he offered himself upon the Cross.* According to this common Notion that all Religions had of Priests, he saith in his Words cited in the Page foregoing, that the Priests were more excellent than their Brethren, only upon the account of the Priesthood, and that Aaron made Atonement for the People, standing between the Living, and the Dead, because he was a Priest. Indeed it is difficult not to observe, how the very Heathens, tho' so bewildred in Polytheism, by the Delusions of Devils, yet with the original Notions of Temples, Altars, and Sacrifices, retained that of Priests, and believed that their Intercessions as such, were most powerful to remove divine Judgments, and impetrate divine Blessings, and Favours, and that the Anger of Heaven was more easily atoned by their Prayers, than those of other Men. They also esteemed Priests, as holy Persons, and the Affronts, and Indignities which Men put upon them, they understood to be put upon their Gods. These first Notions of Religion, and some others, as of Blasphemy, and Sacrilege they held in

common



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 191

common with the Church of God, and therefore they offered all their Sacrifices for the publick Safety by Priests only, and to them they had recourse when any publick Calamity was to be averted, or any great and publick Blessing was to be obtained, accounting them as the immediate Ministers of the Gods, by whom they dispensed their Favours to Men. For this reason they called them καθαῖται, i. e. *Purgators, or Cleansers*, because by their Sacrifices, and Intercessions they thought they were cleansed, and purified from their Sins, and delivered from the Punishments due unto them. That Greek word comes from καθαίρω, which in common Acceptation literally signifies to purge, cleanse, or purify, as John xv. 2. but in its religious, and tropical sense it signifies to expiate, Heb. ix. 2. *The Law can never with those Sacrifices which they offered Year by Year continually make the Comers thereunto perfect; for then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because that the Worshipers once purged should have no more Conscience of Sins.* This is otherwise expressed by καθαρίσμον ποιῆν, Heb. i. 3. *Who when he had by himself purged our Sins, sat down on the right Hand of the Majesty on High.* It is likewise expressed by καθαρίσω, Ch. ix. 14. *For if the Blood of Bulls, and Goats sanctifieth to the purifying of the Flesh; how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered up himself without spot to God, purge your Consciences from dead Works.* He as our sovereign Pontiff, who put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, is our great *Purgator* in the primary, and most principal sense of the Word, as it is written, 1 John i. 7. *The Blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all Sin.* But then according to his holy Will, and Ordinance, and in virtue of his all-powerful Expiation, his Priests are also [καθαῖται] *Purgators*, and in a secondary

## 192 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

ministerial sense expiate the Sins of the People. This was true of the Levitical Priests, who had Power not only to *purifie* the Flesh, as in case of the Leprosie, but to expiate the Sins of a <sup>z</sup> Ruler, of <sup>a</sup> any one of the common People, nay of the <sup>b</sup> whole Congregation, as it is written, *The Priest shall make Atonement, or the Priest shall make Atonement before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him.* So the Evangelical Ministers are all *Purgators*, or <sup>d</sup> atoning Ministers, all their Offices being instituted for the *Pardon or Remission of Sins.* Their Baptism is for the washing away of Sins, as it was said by *Ananias to Saul, Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord.* The Office of the Holy Eucharist is all of an atoning Nature; for it is a commemorative Sacrifice of that, which Christ offered upon the Cross, and the Priest delivers it to the faithful Communicants, as a Pledge of their Salvation, and a Seal of the Pardon of their Sins. The Office of *Absolution* in his Name, and by his Authority, as well as in the virtue of his all-sufficient Merits, is also for the purging, and putting away of Sin, as it was spoken by his own blessed Lips, *Whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retained, and whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them;* and let us glorifie God, who hath given such ministerial Power of

<sup>z</sup> Lev. iv. 22.

<sup>a</sup> 27.

<sup>b</sup> 13.

<sup>c</sup> The Hebrew כפר, which we render to *make Atonement*, and other Versions to *make expiation*, or to *propitiate*, *expiate*, *pacify*, or *reconcile*, the Spanish Translation of the *Jews* renders by such Expressions, *Pardonar por pardonar sobre, para pardonar sobre*, and by *perdonanças*, as *de sangre de limpieza de las perdonanças, Plata de las perdonanças*, &c. that is to say, to procure Pardon or Forgiveness, the Sin-offering of Pardon, or Forgiveness, the Pardon, or Forgiveness-Money, or Atonement Money.

<sup>d</sup> Const. Apost. Lib. viii. cap. 5. Δός—ἐμὶ τὸ Δεῶν σε τὸν δέ—*Ἐπισκοπὸν σε τὸ πρεσβυτερον*, &c. Give unto this thy Servant, who is chosen by thee to be a Bishop, Grace to feed thy holy Flock,—and by making Atonement in thy Presence, &c.

*pardoning*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 193

pardoning unto Men. But this by the way of the Jewish, and Christian Ministry, or Priesthood, of which my Undertaking will oblige me to speak again. And therefore to proceed from Heathenism to the Patriarchal Religion; in the Times of the Patriarchs, the Priests, and Prophets empowered to act as Priests, were also *Purgators* by God's Appointment to expiate Sins.

So when *Aimelech* King of *Gerar*, had taken *Sarah*, *Abraham's* Wife, God said unto him in a Dream; *Restore the Man his Wife, for he is a Prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live*; and so *Abraham*, <sup>e</sup> who was a Priest, as well as a Patriarch, and Prophet, prayed unto God for him, and God healed him, and his House. So <sup>e</sup> *Cosmas Indicopleustes* describes *Melchisedeck* as an Intercessor by virtue of his Priestly Office in these Words: *ὁ βασιλεὺς, &c.* This is the King, who instructed the People committed to him to be conversant in these things, and by ministering in holy things in this Order [of the Priesthood] made Atonement for his own People———And this Man first as a Priest having blessed *Abraham*, and offered up Thanks to God, took Tithes of all that *Abraham* had. Nay, I might have begun with <sup>s</sup> *Abel*, *Enoch*, and *Noah*,

<sup>e</sup> *Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 41. p. 675. 'Ο Λευὶτὴς Ἀβραάμ—ὁ πατεῖς ὁ τὸ ἀρετῆς καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρῶς τηρεῖται ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἐκείνου θυσιῶν προσέδωκε τὴν θυσιάν ὡς Μωϋσῆς.* This he spake of his Father in Allusion to *Abraham*, of whose Sacrifice he speaks properly, *Orat. 20. p. 166. Μῆσας ὁ Ἀβραάμ, &c. Orat. 13. p. 472. καὶ ὁ Ἀβραάμ θυσιῶν, &c. Orat. 13. p. 472. καὶ ὁ Ἀβραάμ θυσιῶν, &c. Orat. 22. p. 399. ὁ τὸ Ἀβραάμ θυσιῶν, &c.*

<sup>f</sup> *Topograph. Christiana. Lib. v. p. 217. publish'd with Euseb. Cesariens. Comment on the Psalms, &c. in Folio, at Paris, by D. Bernard Montfaucon, a Benedictine Monk.*

<sup>s</sup> *Hieron. in Epist. ad Evagrium. Tom. III. Edit. Basil. Abel quoque & Enoch, & Noe placuerunt Deo, & victimas obtulerint—simul & hoc tradunt, quod usque ad Sacerdotium Aaron omnes primogeniti ex stirpe Noe, cujus series, & ordo describitur fuerint Sacerdotes, & Deo victimas obtulerint.*

## 194 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

<sup>b</sup> who were all Priests, as well as Patriarchs, and as such offered up Sacrifices of Atonement for themselves and their People. When *Noah* went out of the Ark he built an Altar unto the Lord, and offered Burnt-offerings upon it of every clean Beast, and Fowl, and the Lord smelled a sweet Savour, and was so pleased with his priestly Administration, that he said in his Heart, *I will not curse the Ground any more for Man's sake, neither will I again smite every living thing, as I have done.* But to proceed, so <sup>i</sup> God bid *Job's* Friends, when his Anger was kindled against them, go to him with a Burnt-offering, and he (saith he) shall pray for you, and him will I accept. For <sup>k</sup> *Job*

<sup>a</sup> In the Prayer of Consecration of a Bishop, *Const. Apost.* lib. viii. cap. 5. *Ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, &c.* Thou who from the beginning appointedst Priests to preside over thy People, Abel at first, Seth, and Enos, and Enoch, and Noah, and Melchisedech, and Job: Who didst constitute Abraham, and the rest of the Patriarchs, with thy holy Servants Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, and Phineas; who didst of them elect Princes, and Priests [*Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, καὶ ἱερεῖς*] to serve in the Tabernacle of the Testimony; who chosest Samuel to be a Priest, and a Prophet; who never didst leave thy Sanctuary without Ministers, &c. So St. Chrysost. Hom. in *Genesin* xxxv. *Μελχισεδέκ—ἱερεὺς ὃν ὁ ὁ ἰσως αὐτοχρηστὸν ἐστίν, &c.* Melchisedech was a Priest perhaps ordained by himself, (for such were Priests then) either because his People attributed that honour to him for his seniority, or that he devoted himself to the Priesthood, as Noah, as Abel, as Abraham, when they offered Sacrifices. But I do not doubt they were also called, and approved by God at least by Signs, as this Father saith that Aaron [*ἐκ χειρὸς ἰσων*] was by the Fire that fell from Heaven upon *Corah* and his Crew, and by the blossoming Rod, *Numb.* Chap. xvi. and xvii. Thus it is written of *Abel*, that God had respect to him, and his Offering, and as the Apostle speaks, *Hebr.* xi. 4. bore Testimony to his Gifts, or Oblations, *nempe igne calitus missa super ea dona*, as learned Men generally expound the place. And so *Gen.* viii. 21. God is said to have smelled a sweet Savour from the Sacrifice of *Noah*, who doubtless was a Priest, as well as a Prophet before the Flood.

<sup>i</sup> *Job*, Ch. xlii. 8, 9.

<sup>k</sup> In *Job* volumine legimus, quod & ipse oblato munus fuit, & Sacerdos, & quotidie, pro filiis suis hostias immolavit. Hieron. in *Epist. ad Evagrium*, Tom. III. p. 49. Edit. Basil. Quid *Job* in operibus promptius, &c. *Cyprianus de lapsis.*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 195

was a Priest, as well as a Prince, or a Sacerdotal Patriarch, who, according to the Practice of those times, when Princes of Tribes, and Countries were Priests, offered as many Burnt-offerings as he had Sons to make Atonement for, if perhaps they had sinned against God in the time of their feasting with one another. So *Moses* was a <sup>1</sup> Priest, as well as a Prophet, and a <sup>n</sup> King; Priest in such an eminent manner, that *Grotius*, whom I cited before, had no occasion to mend the Versions of the sixth Verse, in the xcix Psalm, which all Translations, as well as ours, render *Moses, and Aaron among his Priests*. For as Priest, or Sacerdotal Prince, ° he builded an Altar under the Hill, and Twelve Pillars according to the Twelve Tribes of *Israel*, and <sup>p</sup> offered one of the most solemn Sacrifices of Burnt-offerings, and Peace-offerings unto the Lord, that ever was offered to him, even that holy fœderal Sacrifice, of which he took half the Blood, and put it in Basons, and half of it it he sprinkled on the Altar; and

<sup>1</sup> Greg. Nazianz. *Orat. Sexta.* ἱερεὺς δὲ ὁμοίως Ἀμφότεροι Μωϋσῆς γάρ, φησι, καὶ Ἀαρὼν, &c. Both were equally Priests, for he saith *Moses, and Aaron among his Priests*.

<sup>m</sup> Καὶ ἐνδεσχεὺς Μωυσιῷ δεικνὺς βασιλῆα, καὶ νομοθέτην, καὶ ἀρχιερέα, τὸ τῆς Ἀλφῶν ἐρχομαι δηλώσων, ὅτι καὶ περὶ τῆς γένεως δοκιμῶταί. Philo. Lib. III. de Vita Mosi.

<sup>n</sup> Deut. xxxiii. 5.

<sup>o</sup> Exod. xxiv.

<sup>p</sup> It is said, *Moses sent young Men of the Children of Israel, who offered Burnt-offerings, and sacrificed Peace-offerings unto the Lord.* These young Men were the First-born, or Priests of every Family, who were afterwards redeemed, when the Children of *Israel* solemnly offered up the Tribe of *Levi* to God for his Service. *Numb.* Ch. viii. 6, 9, 10, 11, 13. so *Ch.* iii. from v. 5. to v. 14. The young Men then were such Priests as these, and therefore the Chaldee Paraphrase reads it, *Moses sent the First-born.* To which agree the Arabick, and Persian Translation, as Mr. Selden observed, de Success. in Pontif. Hebr. C. II. & de Success. ad leg. Hebr. C. V. and Dr. Cudworth in his *True Notion of the Lord's Supper*, London, 1642. sixteen Years before the Polyglot Bible was printed. See also *Martinii Lexicon Philologicum* in the word *Sacrificium*.

## 196 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

when he had read the Book of the Covenant in the Audience of all the People, he sprinkled the Blood upon them, and said, *Behold the Blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you.* As a <sup>a</sup> Priest he offered another most solemn Sacrifice to God, when he consecrated *Aaron*, and his Sons to minister to him in the Priest's Office, at which time he took of the Blood of the Ram of Consecration, and sprinkled it upon the Altar, and put it upon the Tips of their right Ears, the Thumbs of their right Hands, and the great Toes of their right Feet, and also sprinkled it with the holy Oil upon them, and their Garments; by which, as the Text saith, *Aaron, and his Garments were hallowed, and his Sons, and their Garments with him.* As a Priest he had Power to go <sup>r</sup> into the Tabernacle to speak with God, whose Voice he heard from the Mercy seat from between the two Cherubims, and to bless the People with *Aaron*; and to hasten to my Subject, as a Priest he cried unto the Lord for <sup>r</sup> *Miriam*, and the Lord healed her; as a Priest <sup>r</sup> he interceded with God after the Sin of the Golden Calf, when the Lord said, *let me alone that I may consume them.* But he made Atonement for their Sin by his Intercession, and upon <sup>u</sup> the Continuance of his Mediation by earnest Prayers, and Supplications, God also promised to let his Presence go with them, and to give them rest. His Prayers, as a Priest obtained the Victory over *Amalek*, according to that of <sup>w</sup> *Gregory Nazianz.* God by the secret and mystical Figure of *Moses's* Hands discomfited *Amalek*; so powerful were the Hands of a Priest held up upon the Mountain, and put in the posture of Prayer to obtain a Victory, which many Myriads of Men

<sup>a</sup> Exod. xxix.

<sup>r</sup> Numb. xii. 13.

<sup>u</sup> Exod. xxxiii. 13, 14.

<sup>r</sup> Numb. vii. 89. Lev. ix. 23.

<sup>r</sup> Exod. xxxii. Deut. ix.

<sup>w</sup> Orat. 30.

could

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 197

could not have obtained. \* At *Taberah* also, when the Lord was provoked to consume the People with Fire, he prayed unto the Lord as a Priest, and the Fire was quenched. And to conclude, as a sacerdotal Prince he mediated between God, and the People at *Horeb*, when as he speaks, *Deuter. v. 5. I stood between the Lord, and you at that time;* and with respect to which the Law that God then gave them, is said by the Apostles to have been *ordained by Angels in the Hands of a Mediator.* So after *Aaron*, and his Sons were consecrated to the Priest's Office, and the Priesthood was as it were entailed upon them, they became by virtue of their Office the great Mediators betwixt God, and Men in the Jewish Church. I have already more than once mentioned *Aaron's* staying the Plague by offering Incense in the Jewish Camp, and in the xxx. Chapter of *Exodus*, verse 10. it is said of the Altar of Incense, *That Aaron shall make Atonement upon the Horns of it once in a Year, with the Blood of the Sin-offering of Atonements, as being most holy unto the Lord.* This was done on the tenth Day of September, the great Day of Expiation, which is particularly described in *Levit. xvi.* where we read, how the High-Priest on that Day of every Year made Atonement for himself, for his House, and for all the Congregation of *Israel*, by Sacrifices there mentioned, and by entering into the most holy place within the Veil with a Censer full of burning Coals of Fire from off the Altar, and his Hands full of sweet Incense, the Cloud of which was to cover the Mercy-seat, and with his Finger to sprinkle the Mercy-seat Eastward seven times with the Blood of

---

\* Numb. xi. 1, 2.

† *Ego sequester, & medius fui inter Dominum & vos in illo tempore.* Versio vulg. *Cum quidem ego tunc inter Jovem, & vos enuntiandorum illius dictorum sequester essem.* Castal. Cyprianus de Lap. sis. *Nam Moyses pro peccatis, &c.*

## 198 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Sin-offerings, as the Apostle observes, *Heb. ix. 7.* where he saith, *But into the second went the High Priest alone once every Year, not without Blood, which he offered for himself, and for the Errors of the People.* To this let me add the Example of Samuel's Mediation, and Intercession for the People, *1 Sam. vii.* There the Children of Israel said unto Samuel, *Cease not to cry unto the Lord our God for us.* And Samuel said, *Gather all Israel together at Mizpeh, and I will pray for you unto the Lord.* And Samuel took a sucking Lamb, and offered it for a Burnt-offering wholly to the Lord for Israel, and the Lord heard him. So in Chapter xii. the People said again unto him; *Pray for thy Servants unto the Lord thy God, that we die not, for we have added unto all our Sins this evil to ask us a King:* To whom he answered; *God forbid, that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you.* For to intercede with God for the People was the common Office of all Priests, as we read in the xcix. Psalm, and the 6th Verse. *Moses and Aaron among his Priests, and Samuel among them, that call upon his Name: They called upon the Lord, and he answered them.* As for the Atonement which the Priests of the second Order made for the People, they are at large, and in order set down in the seven first Chapters of *Leviticus*, where nothing can be plainer than that it was the Priest's Office, as their Orator to<sup>2</sup> confess the Sins of the People, and to make Supplications, and Intercessions for them by Sacrifice, or without it, as is evident from the ix. and x. Chapters of *Ezra*, and the ix. of *Nehemiah*, to which I refer you, and from the second of *Joel*, from the 12<sup>th</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> Verse, where the Prophet saith, *Rent your Heart, and not your Garments— Blow the Trumpet in Zion— gather the People, sanctifie the Congregation—*

---

<sup>2</sup> Levit. xvi.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 199

<sup>a</sup> Let the Priests, the Ministers of the Lord, weep between the Porch, and the Altar, and let them say, Spare thy People, O Lord — Then will the Lord be jealous for his Land, and pity his People. Here, Sir, for the sake of your late Writer, let me descant a little on the Prophet's Definition of a Priest: *The Priests, the Ministers of the Lord.* משרתי יהוה *Mishorte Jehovah*, in the Greek Version οἱ λειτουργοὶ τῆς κυρίας, *those who minister to the Lord*, in the Chaldee Paraphrase, *those who minister before the Lord*, and you may see in the Margin how aptly St. Hierom applies the place to the Christian Priests. To these let me add two more Descriptions of the Jewish Priests out of Philo in his Life of Moses: The first of which is this, οἱ ἐπιτέροντες τὰ πρὸς τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας λειτουργίας, *to whom the care of Prayers, and Sacrifices, and all other (holy) Ministrations is committed.* The other is this: ὁ δὲ τὸ ἱερουργεῖν, μὴ μόνον τὰ ἀνθρώπεια, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ θεῖα διέπν, *Moses, as a Priest, did not only administer [or preside over] humane, but divine Affairs.* Sir, all these Descriptions of a Priest, with that of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, come to no more than this, that a Priest of any Religion, is a Minister of his God over the People, to take care of his Worship, whatever that is, and its Rites, and all other holy Ministrations, in his Rank, and Order; and if this be a good Definition of a proper Priest, and ade-

---

<sup>a</sup> S. Hierom upon the place: Postquam Sacerdotes pro populo deprecati sunt & dixerunt Parce, Domine, populo tuo, &c. Zelatus est Dominus terram suam, quam prius quasi alienam contemperat, & passus fuerat, locustâ vastante, populari — etiam nostris temporibus vidimus agmina locustarum terram texisse Judæam, quæ postea misericordiâ Domini inter Vestibulum, & Altare, hoc est, inter Crucis, & Resurrectionis locum, Sacerdotibus, & populis Deum deprecantibus atque dicentibus parce populo tuo: vento surgente, in mare primum, & novissimum præcipitata sunt.

## 200 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

quate to the thing defined, I appeal to you, Sir, whether Bishops, and Presbyters are not proper Priests. Other modern Writers define a <sup>b</sup> Priest by his Office thus: *A Person, whose Office it is to perform divine Services to God, and in his Name to bless the People*, which, I think, cannot be denied to belong to a Bishop, or Presbyters of the Church. <sup>c</sup> *The Lord thy God (saith Moses) hath chosen the Priests the Sons of Levi to come near to him, and minister to him, and to bless in the Name of the Lord.* And so hath he chosen the Orders of Bishops, and Presbyters to approach him, and minister to him, and bless the People also in his Name. So in 1 Chron. xvii. 13. it is likewise written. *Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his Sons for ever to burn Incense before the Lord, to minister unto him, and bless in his Name for ever.* This is a Description of the Priests under the Jewish Law, and Sanctuary, but then, Sir, you know, as I have already observed, that <sup>d</sup> *the Priesthood being changed, there was a necessity that a change should also be made of the Law*; and therefore excepting the burning of Incense, which was an appointed Rite of the Jewish Priesthood, and Worship, and abolished by the change of the Law, every word of this Description of the Jewish Priests, belongs properly to the Christian Liturgs, or Ministers, and by consequence they must be proper Priests. So saith St. Hierom on Isaiah lxvi. 21, 22. *Quando dicit, assumam ex iis in Sacerdotes, & Levitas, ostendit vetus Sacerdotium prætermissum, &c.* When he saith, I will take of them for Priests, and Levites, he shews that the old Levitical Priesthood is laid aside, which descended not by Election, but by natural Order, and Family-succession;

<sup>b</sup> Outram. de Sacrificiis, p. 47. *Propria erant Sacerdotii munera, ut Deo rem divinam facerent, ejusque nomine populo benedicerent.*

<sup>c</sup> Deut. xxi. 5.

<sup>d</sup> Hebr. vii. 12.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 201

for the Priesthood being changed, it was necessary there should be an Alteration of the Law, and that they should be made Priests by Election, upon whom the Priesthood was to be conferred, not by right of Blood, but according to Merit, and Virtue; who should come from the Nations of the Gentiles, and declare the Glory of the Lord, and be brought upon Horses, and in Chariots, and in Litters, and upon Mules. So on Ezek. xliv. 30. The first of all that we eat (saith he) is also offered to the Priests, that we may taste nothing of our new Fruits, till the Priest hath first tasted of them. And this we do, that he laying up our Blessings, and Offerings in his House, God may bless our Houses, when he prays for us. So on those words of Malachi to the Priest, Ch. XI. O ye Priests, if you will not hear, if you will not lay it to Heart, and give Glory to my Name—I will curse your Blessings. “ This (saith “ he) is properly said to the Priests, that if they will “ not hear, &c. but on the contrary, cause his Name “ to be ill spoken of among the Gentiles, he would “ send among them a want of all good Things, and “ turn their very Blessings into Curses. For those “ Priests who abuse their Health in Lust, and convert their Riches into Luxury, and disgrace their “ honourable Character with sordid Conversation, “ they change the Blessings of God into a Curse. Or “ otherwise this word is truly directed to Priests, “ who when they do not bless the People of God “ with true Affection of Heart, as Isaac blessed Jacob, Jacob the Patriarchs, and Moses the Twelve “ Tribes, their Blessings are turned into Curses.

But to return from this Digression to the Priestly Mediation, I need not farther insist on the Priestly Acts of Prayer, and Intercession performed by Prophets *Jure Prophetico*, upon extraordinary Occasions. So *Elijah* built an Altar to the Lord on Mount Carmel, and sacrificed, and prayed, saying, Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this People may know,

## 202 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*that thou art the Lord God.* Then the Fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the Burnt-sacrifice, and the Wood, and the Stones, and the Dust, and licked up the Water, which was in the Trench. After which he proceeded to intercede with God for Rain after the Drought of three Years. *He prayed earnestly [saith St. James] and the Heaven gave Rain, and the Earth brought forth her Fruit.*

XII. Such were the publick Intercessions of other Prophets, which I pass over, hastening to my main point, which is to shew in the second place, that Christian *Liturgs*, or Ministers by their Office are Mediators, or Intercessors with God for the People, to make Atonement for their Sins, and impetrate Favours, and Blessings for them, and by consequence that they are *proper Priests*. For tho' other Offices are join'd with the Priest's Office, and by consequence belong in common to Priests of all Religions, yet nothing is more essential to the Character of Priests than to be *Advocates, or Intercessors for Men with God*. For the Office of Teaching, and Preaching belongs to them as Doctors, or Prophets, and that of governing the sacred Oeconomy belongs to them as Rectors, or Stewards appointed by the God whose Priests they are, and both have the People for their Objects, or relate to them; but to make Intercession belongs to a Priest, as a Priest, and hath the God, with whom he intercedes, for its Object, and therefore with regard to this most proper Office of Priesthood, some have defined a Priest to be [*Patronus hominum apud Deum*] an Advocate, or Orator for Men with God. Which belongs in the greatest propriety and fulness of Perfection to Christ, whom the Apostle in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, calls ten times an High-priest, and seven



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 203

times a Priest. He is [the Ἁρχιερεὺς λόγιος] the λογικός High-priest, who was as a Priest with his Father before the beginning of the World, and in the Virtue of whose meritorious Sacrifice, to be offered at the appointed time, the Jewish Priests, tho' they knew it not, made Atonement for the Sins of the People. But now more eminently as High-priest of his Church he is our Advocate with the Father, and makes Intercession for us at the right Hand of God. And because he continued for ever, and hath an unchangeable Priesthood, he is able to save them to the uttermost, who come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make Intercession for them. <sup>1</sup> He entered into the Holy of Holies, on purpose to appear as an Advocate in the Presence of God for us, and <sup>m</sup> was therefore made like unto his Brethren, that he might be a merciful, and faithful High-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the Sins of the People. And because this Mediation with his Father, as our High-Priest, is so powerful, and prevalent, therefore are we bid to <sup>n</sup> come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain Mercy through him <sup>o</sup> who is the one Mediator between God, and Man. And as he intercedes for us, as our supreme Advocate, and Orator in

<sup>f</sup> Philo de Pont. Max. λέγουσι γὰρ ὁ Ἁρχιερεὺς, ἐκ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν λόγον ἔχει, πάντων ἐκ ἐκυσίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκυσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον. I speak of an High-priest, who is not a Man, but the Word of God, not only free from all voluntary, but involuntary Sins.

<sup>g</sup> Philo de vita Mosis : Ἀναγκαῖον ὡς ἱερῶν μόνον τοῦ κόσμου παρὰ τῶν ἀκαλῶν χειρὶς τῆς ἰστορίας ὁ ἀρετῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τε ἀμνηστῶν ἀδικημάτων, καὶ χορηγῶν ἀφρονολόγων ἀσθενῶν. It is necessary for him, who sacrifices to the Father of the World to use the Son, who is most perfect in all Virtue, as Mediator, or Advocate, both to obtain Pardon of Sins, and the grant of those gracious Blessings, which he desires.

<sup>h</sup> John xi. 1, 2.

<sup>k</sup> Hebr. vii. 24, 25.

<sup>l</sup> Hebr. iv. 16.

<sup>i</sup> Rom. viii. 34.

<sup>j</sup> Hebr. ix. 24.

<sup>o</sup> 1 Tim. xi. 5.

<sup>m</sup> Hebr. ii. 17, 18.

Heaven,

## 204 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Heaven, and presents our Prayers to his Father, in Virtue of his own Merits : So do his Ministers upon Earth intercede for us in his Name, and therefore they must be Priests in this respect, as with respect to teaching, and governing the People, they are Prophets, and spiritual Rulers over them in their several Ranks.

They must be Priests in this Respect, as much as the Ministers, or *Liturgs* of the Patriarchal, and Jewish Churches were, who made Atonement for the People by Sacrifice, and Prayer, and often by Prayer without Sacrifice ; for what belonged in common to God's Ministers under both these Dispensations, must needs belong to his Ministers of the most perfect, and excellent Evangelical Oeconomy, unless it can be imagined it was his Pleasure, that the most noble Church, and Institution, should have the meanest, and least noble Ministry, without the sacerdotal Power of making Intercession for the People, which the Ministers of his Church before, and under the Law had. But why do I say, *unless it can be imagined* ? I ought rather to say, *unless it can be proved*. For as those who have written in Defence of *Infant-Baptism*, argue for it from the right that Infants had to be admitted into the Covenant of Grace in the Jewish Church, and tell the Adversaries of it, that the Condition of Children would be worse under the Gospel, than it was under the Law, if they might not be baptized under the one, as well as circumcised under the other ; and when the *Anti-pedo-baptists* require a Precept for it, tell them it lies upon them to bring a Precept against it : So it is an excellent Argument to prove the Ministers over the Christian Church to be proper Priests, and as such to have the Power, and Dignity of making solemn Intercession for the People, because the Ministers of God, over his Church in the Patriarchal, and Jewish Dispensations, were such Priests. The  
Sacer-

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 205

Sacerdotal Power which was common to the Ministerial, or Liturgical Office in such different Dispensations, must therefore belong to it now, unless something to the contrary can be shewn in the Gospel; but, *Sir*, until that is shewn, we ought to presume; that Christian *Liturgs* are proper *Priests*, who are not inferior to the Patriarchal, and Jewish Ministers, in the Essentials of the sacerdotal Office, and Power. For they are taken from among Men, as *they* were, and like them are ordained for Men to minister for them in things pertaining to God, and so have the same common Office, and Ministry, though not the same Ceremonies, Rites, and Forms of *Praying*, and *Entreating*, and *Propitiating*, and *Expiating* God's Anger, and *Deprecating* his Judgments, and making *Reconciliation* for Sinners; which are the several Terms in the <sup>p</sup> Latin Translation for what we render *Atonement*, and *making Atonement*, and aptly express the Office of an Advocate, which is to pray, and intreat, and plead for his Criminal Client, whose Orator he is; to propitiate the King, or Judge, in whose Presence he stands for him, and to procure Pardon for his Offences. *Pray not thou for this People* (saith God to the Priest, and Prophet Jeremiah) *nor lift up Cry, or Prayer for them,* <sup>q</sup> *neither make Intercession to me, for I will not hear thee.* That is, do not thou be their Advocate, to intercede, and pray, and plead for them,

---

<sup>p</sup> Exod. xxix. 36. *ad expiandum.* xxx. 10. *Deprecabitur Aaron, & placabit,* v. 16. *propitiatur animabus eorum,* xxxii. 30. *Si quo modo qui vero eum deprecari pro scelere vestro.* Lev. i. 4. *In expiationem ejus,* iv. 20. *rogante pro eis Sacerdote,* the Priest praying for them. So v. 27. *rogabit pro eo Sacerdos,* v. 6. *Orabit pro ea Sacerdos,* & *pro peccato ejus,* vi. 7. *rogabit pro ea coram Domino.* Numb. xvi. 25. *rogabit Sacerdos pro omni multitudine filiorum Israel.* Lev. xvi. 10. *statuit eum (Caprum emissarium) vivum coram Domino, ut fundat preces super eo,* to make an Atonement with him.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. vii. 16.

## 206 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

do not come to me about them, for I will not hear thee.

XIII. In like manner it belonged to the Apostles, and Presbyters, by Virtue of their sacerdotal Office, and Ministry, to be Advocates, and Intercessors, with God, and as such, to pray and entreat God for the People, and by Prayer, to obtain Pardon, or make Atonement for their Sins, and propitiate him, and to procure Favours, and Blessings of him for them. There are Instances to prove this in the New Testament, as short a Memorial as it is of the Practice of the first Ministers of the Church. I need not insist upon their Power, of ' Baptizing for the Remission of Sins with ' Fasting, and Prayer, which was a most solemn Act of " Expiation, for washing

---

' Μὴ προσέλθης μοι πρὶς αὐτῶν LXX. The same Phrase is used of the Priests, Deut. xxii. 5. and I cannot but observe, that Phrases of that kind are specially applied by the Gentiles to their Priests, to set forth the Intercessions they believed they had Power to make with their Gods. So Jul. Pollux. lib. i. cap. i. segm. 25. πρὶς τῶν θεῶν προσιόντων θεοῖς, προσίεναι θεοῖς, προσοδὸν ποιῶντες πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, εὐχεσθαι θεοῖς. Ἀνάγειν τὰς χεῖρας, ἐπιστάναι θεοῖς. Προερέπειν θεῶς. Κατακλίνειν θεῶς, ἀνακλίνειν θεῶς. Ἀσπεῖν πρὸς τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἄσπεα. Προσφύσκειν θεοῖς. Προσνιᾶν, ἐπαυτολογεῖν, καὶ ἀντιστολίζειν, καθικέλειν, δύνειν θεοῖς, ἱερουργεῖν, ἱεροποιεῖν, &c. Of those, who have access to the Gods; to go unto the Gods; to pray to the Gods; to stretch out Hands unto the Gods; to intercede with the Gods; to atone the Gods; to ask Blessings of the Gods; to fly to the Gods; to obsecrate the Gods; to meet, or confront, and supplicate the Gods; to perform holy Offices in things pertaining to the Gods. All which Phrases are most proper to the Office of Christian Ministers, changing GODS into GOD, and by Consequence prove them to be Priests. So Segm. 29. Θυσία, κατάκλησις θεῶν, ἀνάκλησις, ἐνδύξις, προσοδός, ἱερουργία, ἱεροποιία. πρὸν δὴ. Sacrifice, calling upon the Gods, crying unto the Gods, Intercession, coming to the Gods, performing holy Offices, Sacrificing, Libation. See Herodot. Hist. Lib. I. p. 57.

' Acts xi. 38. xxii. 16.

" Just. Mart. Apol. i. Edit. Oxon. LXXIX. LXXX.

\* Ἀφορμὴ βαπτισίας καὶ καθαρῶν αὐρισημάτων. So the Bishops, that instructed Constantine the Great, called Baptism. So Rom. Lib. I. Cap. iii. away



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 207

away all the past Sins of the Baptized. Nor need I spend much time to prove, that it was their Office to administer the holy Eucharist, in which more especially they exercised the Priest's Office in making Prayers, and Intercessions at the holy Altar upon the account and in virtue of the same \* Sacrifice, that Christ makes continual Intercession in the Presence of God for us. And to these solemn Prayers and Intercessions, which the Priests make in the holy Eucharist, the People with all the Powers of their Souls are to say *Amen*. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless (saith the Apostle) is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* It is their Office then to make Atonement most especially in this Sacrifice, which consists in the Celebration of the Sacrifice which Christ made upon the Cross, when they make a most solemn Memorial, and Representation of it unto God upon Earth, correspondent to that, which he daily makes of it before him in Heaven. It was they only who administered this pure commemorative Sacrifice of Propitiation: Bishops, or Presbyters licensed by their Bishops, as St. Ignatius speaks in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, *Look upon that Eucharist as lawful, and valid, which is either offered by the Bishop, or one, whom he shall appoint.* Hence we read of the Three thousand baptized Persons, who

---

\* Non. Marcel. *Sacrificare est veniam petere, litare est propitiare & votum impetrare.* Virg. Lib. IV. *Æneid.* *Ant. Ling. Lat.* Gothofred. p. 1336. So more at large. *Inter sacrificare, & litare hoc interest sacrificare est veniam petere, litare est propitiare, & votum impetrare.*

*Tu modo posce Deos veniam, sacrisque litatis,* Virg. *Æneid.* IV.

*i. e. impetratis.* Plaut. in *Pœnulo.* *Si Hercle istuc unquam factum est, tum me Jupiter facias, ut semper Sacrificem, neque unquam litem,* *ibid.* p. 723.

## 208 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

were added to the Church, that they continued steadfastly in the Doctrine which the Apostles taught them, and in Fellowship with them, as the Principle of Unity, and in breaking of Bread, and Prayer, as the Eucharist is there described, of which they were the Ministers. And when I consider that Prophets sometimes sacrificed under the Old Testament by extraordinary Commission from God, and that the first Ministers of Christ were generally Prophets, I cannot but think that place in 1 Cor. xiv. 16. is to be understood of the Holy Eucharist's being administered by those prophetical Priests, because both the solemn Words, which our Saviour used at the Institution of it, are likewise used by the Apostles in that place. The Words are *Bless, and give Thanks*. *Jesus*, saith St. Matthew, and St. Mark, *took Bread, and blessed it*; or as St. Luke, *Jesus took Bread, and gave Thanks*: And of the Cup they say, *he took the Cup, and blessed it*; but St. Luke saith, *he took the Cup, and gave Thanks*. For as learned Men have observed, those words in Scripture <sup>1</sup> signifie the same thing, and are indifferently used for one another. And from them the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper came to be called *Eucharistia*, and <sup>2</sup> *Eulogia*, though more generally by the former, than the latter Name. Hence St. Chrysost. Theophylact, and Oecumenius expound this place of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, according to the following Paraphrase: Else when thou shalt bless the Bread, and Wine at the Lord's Supper in an unknown Tongue, how shall the unlearned People say *Amen* at thy Blessing, or giving of Thanks, seeing they understand not what thou sayest. *When thou shalt bless*, you know, Sir, answers to the Eucharistical Phrase, the

<sup>1</sup> De Marca de Sacramento Eucharistia, p. 7, 8, 9. Cameron and Grotius on Matth. xxvi. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus in *eulogia*.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 209

Cup of Blessing which we bless, just now cited, and to that in *Matth. xxvi. 26.* Jesus took Bread, and blessed it; and the other term, *ευχαριστία*, translated by giving of Thanks, most probably is the Church's Name for the Lord's Supper here, as in *St. Ignatius*; for the People then saying *Amen*, answers exactly to that Passage in *Justin Martyr's* first Apology [*ὁ ὡς ἔστιν* *ευχὰς, καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπιδυνάμει λέγων, Ἀμήν*] the Bishop having finished the Prayers, and Offering, all the People say aloud *Amen*. But however that place is to be interpreted, it was the Work of the inspired, or gifted Ministers in the beginning of Christianity to make Intercessions, as is plain from *Rom. viii. 26.* which according to *Origen*, and *St. Chrysost.* upon the place, I shall paraphrase in these Words: *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our Infirmities, for as yet we know not in what manner, or for what we should pray as we ought, but the inspired Minister, by the help of the Spirit, which moves, and directs him, maketh Intercessions in most eminent manner for us, with Sighs, and Groans which cannot be expressed.* What is expressed here by the inspired Liturg's making Intercession for us, in the next Verse is making Intercession for the Saints, that is, for the Church; so that from the beginning it was the Office of Christ's Ministers, as Advocates, or Priests of the Gospel to pray, and

<sup>a</sup> In Libro *ὡς εὐχῆς.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ἵππερ ἐν χερσὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμεῶν.* Pro nobis postulat. Vulg. pro nobis supplicat. Castal. See also *Claud. Espenceum* de Christo Mediatore, Cap. XI. p. 291. Hi ergo Spiritum non Spiritum hoc loco substantiam intelligunt, sed ex divinis ejus charismatibus unum; precatōnis nimirum donum in Apostolica Ecclesiā, quod in communem totius Ecclesię usum, qui divinitus accipiebat pro tota quidem Ecclesiā, sed pro simplicibus, præsertim orandī nescius stans orabat magna cum compunctione, tum alacritate, &c. p. 292. D. Ambrosius respondet Spiritum plerumque poni pro spiritali gratia—— Hic utroque modo exponunt & Spiritum Spiritūs gratiam nominari—— Ita hic, Spiritus postulat, i. e. postulare nos facit. — Quid est interpellat, nisi quod nos interpellare facit.

sup.

## 210 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

supplicate for the People, even for the whole State of his Catholick Church. *Is any Man sick among you ?* (saith St. James) *let him call for the Presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oyl in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and if he have committed Sins they shall be forgiven him.* Let them pray over him, that is, by Imposition of Hands, according to what is written, *Mark xvi. 18.* and anointing him with Oyl in the Name of the Lord. To this purpose speaks St. <sup>c</sup> Chrysost. *The Jewish Priests had power to cleanse the Leprosy of the Body, or rather not at all to cleanse it, but to pronounce when the Lepers were clean of it. — But our Priests have received Power not to cleanse the Leprosy of the Body, but the Uncleaness of the Soul, and not only to judge when we are clean, but to put away our Uncleaness ; so that they who despise them are much wicked, and worthy of greater Punishment, than Dathan, and his Company. For these having the Priesthood in admiration, desired, and endeavoured to get a Dignity, which did not belong to them, — but the others, tho' the Excellency, and Honour of the Priesthood is increas'd, in a way contrary to them, presume to commit a greater Sin. For to aspire to an undue Honour, is not so great a Crime, as to have Contempt for it ; and there is as great a difference in the account of this Sin from that, as between Admiration, and Contempt. Who therefore can have so wretched a Soul, as to despise so excellent a thing ? I think, I may say no Man can be so wicked, but who is acted by the Furies. But to return from this Digression, God hath given the Priests a greater Power, not only of punishing, but of doing good, than he hath given to our Parents by Nature, between whom, and Priests there is as much difference, as between this Life, and that which is to come. Our Parents begat us into this Life,*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 211

But Priests beget us into Life Eternal. Those cannot deliver us from the Death of the Body, or repel any approaching Disease; but these have often saved sick Souls, which were going to Destruction: inflicting upon some a milder Punishment, and not permitting others to fall; and this not only by Doctrine, and Instruction, but by the help of their Prayers; for they do not only regenerate us, but have Power to remit Sins. Is any Sick among you (saith he) let him call for the Presbyters of the Church, &c. Now our Parents by Nature, if any of their Children offend the supreme Powers, and Potentates, they cannot help them; but Priests, though they cannot reconcile Kings, and Princes to us, yet they often propitiate God, when he is angry at us. So in his third Book of the Priesthood: But if any Man will exactly consider what a Bishop doth <sup>a</sup> in things pertaining to God; he will find nothing will require greater, or more exact Care, and Study, than they. For what manner of Person ought he to be, who makes Intercession for the whole City? But why do I say the whole City, and not rather the whole World? and prays God to be propitious to the Sins of all Men, not only of the Living, but of those, who are departed this Life? I truly never thought the great <sup>c</sup> Liberty of interceding by Moses, and Elias, to have been sufficient for such Supplication: For in truth, as the <sup>e</sup> whole World is committed to his Trust, he comes unto God, as the Father of all, beseeching him to put an end to Wars in all the World, and to make Tumults cease every where; and that Peace, and Happiness may succeed in their place, and that all manner of private, or publick Calamities may be speedily removed. Wherefore how ought he to excel those in

<sup>a</sup> Τα πρὸς τὸ Θεόν.

<sup>c</sup> Παρρησίαν.

<sup>e</sup> Note that it was the common Doctrine of Christianity, that the Care of the Catholick Church was committed jointly, as well as severally, and in whole, as well as in part to the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops. In which the Government of the Church differs from the Government of the World.

## 212 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*all things, for whom he makes Intercession to God.* Thus this great, and holy Christian, perhaps, before he was a Priest, wrote of Sacerdotal Intercession. So *Acts, viii.* When *Peter* said to *Simon Magus*, *Repent of thy Wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the Thought of thy Heart may be forgiven thee;* *Simon*, who knew what belonged to the Office of an Apostle, as a Priest, answered, *Pray ye for me to the Lord, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me.* He had seen the new Converts of *Samaria* receive the Holy Ghost by the Prayer of *Peter*, and *John*, and Imposition of their Hands, and therefore he looked upon them as Men, who had special power of Intercession for Sinners with God, and said, *Pray ye, that is, make ye Atonement for me to the Lord, and expiate my Sin, that none of these things come upon me.* And that they, and the Presbyters under them, were the Churches Liturges, and Orators in all publick Assemblies, and upon all Occasions, and officiated for them in things pertaining to God, is also evident from the Writings of the New Testament, tho' they give but a short, and that far from a full, and perfect Account of what was done in the Church. They prayed, as I observed before, at the Confirmation of the Disciples of *Samaria*, and were the Advocates, or Orators upon whose Supplications they received the Holy Ghost, They pray'd in a Congregation of about an hundred and twenty, at the Election by Lot of *Matthias*, to be ordained in the place of *Judas*. *Peter*, and *John* prayed in that Assembly, where the Place was shaken, in which they met together. The Apostles prayed at the Ordination of the seven Deacons, when they laid their Hands upon them. Other publick Liturges, or Ministers at *Antioch*, called Prophets from their propheticall Vocation, ministred to the Lord when the Holy Ghost said unto them, *Separate unto me Barnabas and Saul, unto the Work where-*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 213

whereunto I have called them. So in the solemn Meeting of the Elders at Ephesus, Paul kneeled down, and prayed with them after he had made his Exhortation to them. To conclude, St. Paul in his first Epistle to Tim. 2. Chap. 1. exhorts him in the first place, <sup>a</sup> that he, and all Ministers under him, as the Peoples Orators, should have constant, public Offices of Devotion, consisting of <sup>b</sup> Supplications, or Deprecations for averting hurtful things, Sins, and Dangers. Secondly, of <sup>c</sup> Prayers, or Obsecrations for obtaining Mercies, and Blessings, and good things, of which they stood in need. Thirdly, of <sup>d</sup> Intercessions, or Interpellations for others. And Lastly, of <sup>e</sup> Thanksgiving for Mercies receiv'd, and all these in the greatest extent of Charity for Men of all Conditions, and Ranks. First of all therefore I exhort that [in your Eucharistical Devotions] Supplications, Prayer, Intercessions, and Thanksgiving be made for all Men. Which shews, that as Christian Ministers, like the Jewish, are taken from among Men: So also that like them too, they are Advocates, and Orators at the Throne of Grace, or that they are ordained for Men in things pertaining to God. I have said Eucharistical Devotions, upon the Authority of St. <sup>m</sup> Augustin who so interprets the place: *Sed eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis, vel pene omnis frequentat Ecclesia, &c.* I choose to understand in these words, what the whole, or almost the whole Church declares. that we take precatones, for the Prayers which are made in Celebration of the Mysteries, before that which is on the Lord's Table is blessed; Orationes, for the Prayers when it is blessed, and sanctified, and broken to be distributed; both which almost the whole Church

---

<sup>a</sup> Grot. *Sicut Imperatores Romani mandata dare Præsidibus solebant: ita Paulus in Timotheo mandata dat Episcopis.*

<sup>b</sup> Δεήσεις.

<sup>c</sup> Προσευχæ.

<sup>d</sup> Ἐνδιέσεις.

<sup>e</sup> Ευχαεσίας.

<sup>m</sup> Epist. lix. ad Paulinum, Edit. Paris. 1541.

## 214 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*concludes with the Lord's Prayer.* Then he proceeds to shew the difference between *εὐχὴ* and *προσέυχη*, and shews, that the former is generally used in the Scriptures for *votum*, and the latter for *oratio*, and that in this Text, *oratio* is to be understood of Prayer<sup>n</sup> which attends a Vow; *For all things are devoted,* saith he, *which are offered to God, especially the holy Oblation of the Altar, in which Sacrament we openly make the greatest of Vows, by which we Vow to remain in Christ, that is, in the Union of his Body.* — *Interpellationes, or as your Books have it, postulationes, are then made, when the People are blessed by the Priest. For then the Bishops, as ADVOCATES, offer the People whom they receive, by Imposition of Hands, to the most merciful Potentate. Which being done, and so great a Sacrament received [Gratiarum Actio] all is concluded with giving of Thanks.*

I am not the only, or first Writer that hath taken notice of St. *Augustin's* understanding the 1 *Tim.* ii. 1, 2. of the Sacerdotal Supplications, Prayers, and Intercessions at the Holy Eucharist; or as he expresses it, at the *holy Oblation of the Altar*. I find it observed by our learned Country-man Mr. *Thorndike*, in his ° *Book of Religious Assemblies*, p. 376, 377, 383. And by *Habertus* in his *Pontifical*, p. 283. where he also understands what *Tertullian* saith in *cap.* 30. of his *Apol.* of the Eucharistical Service. And so that Passage *ad Scapulam*, *cap.* 2. may also be understood, *viz.* *Sacrificamus pro imperatore*, in which at the Blessing or Prayer of the Bishop, or celebrating Priest for the People, they were wont to bow their Heads to receive it, the Bishop holding his Hands over them, as a sign that God's Hand was stretched out over them to bless them; and at the same time as we find it in some of the ancient Liturgies, to say

---

<sup>n</sup> *Quam facimus ad votum, id est, πρὸς εὐχὴν;*

• Printed at Cambridge 1642.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 215

this Prayer; Extend, O Lord, thy invisible Hand, and bless thy Servants and Hand-Maidens, and cleanse them from all stain of Flesh, and Spirit, and, account them worthy to be partakers of the Body, and Blood of thy only begotten Son. So at other Times, and upon other Occasions, they used, like the Jewish Priests, to bless, or pray for the People, as is evident from the many Apostolical Prayers, and Benedictions in the New Testament, in which they blessed the People, as *Melchisedeck* blessed *Abraham*. Such are these Salutations, *Grace be to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace, Mercy, and Peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord. Grace to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Grace, and Peace be multiplied unto you, through the Knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ our Lord. Grace be with you, Mercy, and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of the Father in Truth, and Love. And the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Love of God, and the Fellowship (or Communion) of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen.* You know, Sir, that the less is blessed by the greater, and that a Blessing therefore is but an authoritative Prayer of a Superior for an Inferior, as of a Priest for the People, or any single Person among them, tho' like *Abraham*, he may be a temporal Prince. And when the Superior in any relation blesses the Inferior, he blesses him in God's Name, and as one who had power with God to obtain a Blessing for him, as in those other Benedictions of the Apostle, *The Peace of God, which passeth, or surpasseth all Understanding, keep your Hearts, and Minds through Jesus Christ, and, The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the*

---

<sup>p</sup> Haberti. Pontif. 291, 292, 293, &c. 190, 197. Marten de Antiquis ritibus.

## 216 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen.* Such-like is the Salutation, or Blessing of the Clergy of Rome to the Church of Corinth, in the beginning of St. Clement's Epistle. *Grace be to you, and Peace from the Almighty God by Jesus Christ be multiplied.* And in the end: *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, and with all others, who are called by God thro' him.* So in the Salutation of St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: *Mercy unto you, and Peace from God Almighty, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour be multiplied.* So in St. Ignatius's Epistles, as in that to the Church of Smyrna: *All Joy (to you) thro' the immaculate Spirit, and thro' the Word of God.* As in their Absence they blessed their own, and other People when they wrote to them: So when they were present they orally blessed them, and the People were wont to receive their Blessings with all Veneration, as from the Oracles of God. Hence St.<sup>s</sup> Ambrose observes how indecent it is for a Bishop to curse, whose Office it is to bless; and compares the Mouth of such a Bishop to a Fountain, that sends out bitter Waters, and sweet. In particular they looked upon them as Intercessors between them, and God, and that their Prayers, and Intercessions, and Blessings were very powerful with him to avert Judgments, and obtain Mercies, so the great Emperor Julian in his Letter to St.<sup>s</sup> Athanasius: *Our Majesty calls you back, and wills that you return to preach the saving Faith. Go back then to your holy Churches, and feed the People of God, and put up hearty Prayers for our Clemency unto God. For I know that by your Supplication I, and all Orthodox Christians, who believe as I do, shall obtain great Favour, and Protection from God.* So the Bishops of Africa in their Epi-

<sup>a</sup> De Sacerdotio, Cap. IV.

<sup>b</sup> Athanasii Opera Edit. Monach. Ben. Parisiis. Tom. i. pars. ii.  
p. 779.

<sup>c</sup> Cypr. Epist. 67.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 217

file to the Spanish Christians in the Cause of *Basilians*, and *Martialis*: Setting these things before our Eyes, and carefully and religiously considering them, we ought to elect Men of unblemish'd, and upright Lives for Bishops, who holily, and worthily offering Sacrifices of the holy Eucharist to God, may be heard in the Prayers which they make for the Safety of the Lord's People. And according to this received Opinion of the sacerdotal Prayers, the Emperor *Valentinian the First* in his Letter to the *Arian* Bishops, who had persecuted the Orthodox, that met in Council in *Illyricum*; writes thus: Do not (saith he) persecute those who minister to God with all Care, and Diligence, by whose Prayers Wars are made to cease in all the World, and the Assaults of apostate Angels is repelled. And as by Prayer they endeavour to drive away the destroying Demons: So they introduce the publick Ministrations according to Law. Afterwards he calls them "the Stewards, or Procurators of the great King: For so (saith he) our Imperial Majesty always commanded, that the Labourers in the Field of Christ, and the Stewards of the great King should not be persecuted, or oppressed, or vexed, or driven from their Flocks. The Empress *Eudoxia* seeing the *Egyptian* Monks in the Street, as they came up to her, stopp'd her Royal Chariot, and bowing her Head, she desired them to bless, and pray for the Emperor, and her self, and their Children, and for the Empire: This the Empress did to them, not as Monks but as Priests, as it is plain from the preceding Chapter to that cited in the Margin", the chief of them *Dioscorus*, *Isidorus*, and *Petrus* were. The People of *Constantinople* at the return of *St. John Chrysostom* from his Banishment, carry'd him by force into his Church, al-

---

\* Theodor. Eccl. Hist. Lib. IV. Cap. viii.

† Τῆς διοικητῆς καὶ μετὰ τὴν βασιλείαν.

‡ Sozom. Lib. VIII. Cap. xiii.

## 218 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

tho' he told them, they who condemned him, should first revoke their Sentence against him, and compell'd him to bless them, or *give them the Peace of God* in his Throne. And also out of the Church were the Bishops wont to bless the People, wheresoever they met them, and both in, and out of the Church they receiv'd their Benedictions bowing, or upon their Knees. And the sacerdotal Power and Privilege of blessing the People, common both to Bishops and Priests, brings to remembrance what *\*Cosmas Indicopleustes* saith of the Levitical Law, and Priesthood, which was the Ministry of the Law, that they were the Guards, and Fortresses of the Jewish Nation, and of what *St. Ambrose* writes in his short golden Tract of the *Sacerdotal Dignity* to the College of Bishops. *It is fit, saith he, that the Sacerdotal Dignity should be understood by you, that you may the better maintain, and preserve it, and that the Words of the Psalmist may not be applied to you, Man being in Honour, doth not understand, but is like the Beasts that perish. For the Episcopal Honour, and sublime Dignity, my Brethren, cannot be equalled by any comparison. If you should compare it to the Glory of Kings, and the Diadems of Princes, your Comparison would debase it as much, as if you compared the Glittering, and Splendor of Gold to that of Lead. For Kings, and Princes humble themselves at the Knees of Bishops, and kiss their Hands, because they believe they are defended by their Prayers. Thus, Sir, all Christian Kings, and Princes, as well as the common Laity, or People believed, that the Prayer, or Blessing of a Priest was more effectual, than the Prayer of a private Person, because, as St. Chrysostom observes, he prays*

---

\* *Geographia Christiana*, Lib. V. p. 206. *Να τὸ οὐρανὸν προσεύχῃ, ἵνα συλαχθῇ δι' αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ ἱερατικά ὀφεικόμενα τοῦ ἔθνους.*

† *Cap. ii.*



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 219

not barely as a single Person, but as a *Liturg*, or <sup>2</sup>public Minister of God, and the Mouth of the whole Congregation, yea of the whole Catholick Church, as being a Member of that Priesthood, which is but one through the whole World. Wherefore as the Prayer of a Congregation of Saints, or faithful Christians, though consisting but of two, or three, is of more force, than that of a single Person; so must the Prayer of a Priest be, because he represents the Church, being supposed to be always present among his Flock in Person, or in *Spirit*, actually, or virtually by the Authority of Christ committed to him, as it is written by the Apostle, <sup>a</sup> *In the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when you are gathered together, and my Spirit.* And, <sup>b</sup> *To whom you forgive any thing, I forgive also* [*ὃν ὡς ἂν ἑλθῇ*] *in the Person of Christ, i. e. by the Authority, which I have from Christ, in and over his Church.* Indeed these two places relate to the power of binding, and loosing, or excommunicating, and absolving by solemn Prayer in the Church. But their Authority to pray, and intercede, and the Efficacy of their Prayers, and Intercessions, specially called Blessings, was the same upon all other occasions; which was the reason, why in the purest, and most holy times, the People crowded after the Bishops to have their Benedictions, though now to ask the sacerdotal Blessing is grown into too much Contempt, among too many of those, whose Duty it is to desire it; but, I presume, not as is reported, among any of them, who should give it in most solemn manner, *ὃν ὡς ἂν ἑλθῇ*, in the Name of their Master, and great High-priest, Jesus Christ. Certainly if

---

<sup>a</sup> Injunctions by King Edw. VI. 1547. forasmuch as Priests be publick Ministers of the Church, and upon Holydays ought to apply themselves to the common Administration of the whole Parish, &c.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. v. 4.

<sup>b</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 10.

## 220 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

in the patriarchal Churches, the Prayers, (whether in Blessings, or Curses) of Priests, who were Heads of Tribes, and Families, were thought to be of such force, as to be confirmed, and ratified in Heaven, it is reasonable to believe *now*, that the Blessings, and Intercessions of faithful Priests, who are Heads of national, provincial, or parochial Churches, have the same force. And I am so convinced of the powerfulness of sacerdotal Intercession, as *such*, at the Throne of Grace, that I had rather have the benefit of priestly Supplication, and Intercession for me in any time of need, especially in time of Sickness, and at the hour of Death, than thousands of their Gold and Silver, who hate, or but despise, and ridicule Priests.

XIV. I have now, *Sir*, shewed by many Arguments taken from the New Testament, that the Ministers of Christ are *proper Priests*, and that their sacred Office hath all the Essentials of Priesthood, tho' they are not once called Priests, nor *that*, Priesthood in any of those sacred Writings. I have shewed that, like the Jewish Priests, they are taken, or set apart from the People, and, like them, ordained to minister for Men in things pertaining to God. I have shew'd that it is their Office to transact, and negotiate between them, as between two Parties, to stand on the People's part before *God*, and on God's part before the *People*; that they are his Messengers, or Ambassadors, and their Orators, to pray, and supplicate in their Name, that they are Christ's Stewards in his House, his Ministers in his Church, or Kingdom upon Earth, who represent him in his sacerdotal, as well as in his regal, and prophetic Office, by a Coalition, and Union of all the three Offices in one. I have shew'd, that as they are Governours under him, as *King*, and Messengers, and Teachers under him, as a *Prophet*: So are they Priests under him as our *High-priest*, and in virtue

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 221

of the priestly Office advocates to intercede for Men, and as priestly Superiours to bless them, and that they have a *real* Altar, which is the H. Table, and a *real* external Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, or upon supposition, that they have not, that yet they cannot but be Priests; which I have shewed from the Nature of Priesthood, as it is described in the Scriptures, and other both Christian, and Heathen Authors, all which Descriptions I have applied to the Christian Ministry, and Ministers to prove them to be *proper Priests*. As the House of Christ is more noble, than the House of *Moses*, and the Religion of it much more excellent than that of the Jews: So the Ministry of it must be more noble, and excellent too, which yet, as I observed before, cannot be, if it wants the sacerdotal Honour, and Holiness, which the Jewish Ministry had. In the Coalescence of the three Offices into one in our Saviour's Ministers, as well as in his own Person, the Character of Priest is the most noble of the three, and of most Concern, and Comfort to his People: But if they are only teaching, and ruling Ministers under him, and not Priests, you must give me leave to say it again, they are much inferior in Dignity, and Utility to the Jewish Ministers, who had power to bless the People, and to make Atonement for their Sins, as well as to teach, and govern them. *Priests* therefore they must be, otherwise the Ministers of the Gospel are of a Rank, and Order much meaner in many respects than that of the *Cohens*, or Ministers of the Law; nay Priests they must be, or else your *late Writer*, and such Ministers of the Church as he, must be involved in a dangerous Consequence of their own Opinion, which is to be guilty of *Sacrilege* in arrogating to themselves the most proper part of the Priest's Office, which is to stand for them before God, and as their Orators to pray for them, and to supplicate, and intercede for them, as their Advocates

at

## 222 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

at the Throne of Mercy, and likewise to bless them in God's Name, and yet not believe themselves to be proper Priests. But Priests they are in the most proper sense, and so, I think, they are called by God himself in the <sup>c</sup> Old Testament, where foretelling by the Prophet *Isaiah* that the *Gentiles* should become an holy Church, which are the Words in the Contents of the Chapter, then it follows, and I will also take of them for Priests, and for Levites, saith the Lord. Saith *Eusebius Casariensis*, in his Comment on the 22<sup>d</sup> Verse of this Chapter. If there is a new Heaven, and a new Earth, and a new Hierusalem, by consequence there must be new Priests, and Levites. To this place of the Prophet *Isaiah* answers that of *Jeremiah*, Chap. xxxiii. 17, 18. For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a Man to sit upon the Throne of the House of Israel; neither shall the Priests, and Levites want a Man before me to offer Burnt-Offerings, and to kindle Meat-offerings, and to do Sacrifice continually. It is plain from the Contents of the Chapter, that our Church understands this place of the Kingdom of Christ, which is his Church. So most Commentators take it in a spiritual, evangelical Sense, and think that it relates to the times of the Gospel, and the state of the Christian Church. The Commentators on the great *French Bible* are positive, that the place sets forth the Firmness, and Immutability of the Kingdom, and Priesthood of Christ, but then they render Priests, and Levites in both places *Docteurs de l'Eglise, Ministres du S. Evangile*, Teachers of the Church, or Ministers of the Gospel. But according to that Translation, what is become of the two Orders, Priests, and Levites? for the Ministers of the Gospel, according to them, are equal, and make but one Order. Nay, in their own sense of Mini-



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 223

sters without Priesthood, they will scarce allow the Ministers of the Gospel to be meant here, <sup>d</sup> for they say it is rather to be understood of the *whole Household* of the Faithful, who make *one spiritual Priesthood*; it being certain, say they, that the Ministers of the Church are not called *Priests*, or *Levites* in any part of the New Testament. Sir, I suppose your *late Writer* had his Eye upon these Notes, commonly called the *Geneva Notes*, when he said that the Notion of *Bishops being properly Priests*, was *absolutely rejected by the whole Protestant Communion*. But if that place of the Prophet is to be understood of all the faithful, who make one spiritual Priesthood, then *Women* (not to mention Children) are a part of it; *Women*, who never had any share in the Priesthood of the true God: And if so, then I must ask again, What is there left to answer to the *Levites*, in the Text? For the Faithful, and every one of them, whether Men, or Women, are equal in this Privilege of Priesthood without any such Disparity, or Subordination, as the *Levites* had to the Priests. But in the proper *Priesthood*, by which I explain the place with the ancient Church, the Deacons properly answer to Levites, and Bishops, and Presbyters to Priests.

XV. To conclude, Sir, I must tell your *late Writer*, that to say the Ministers of Christ are not *proper Priests*, or their Ministry a *proper Priesthood*, is to affirm with the *Deists*, and other Enemies of

---

<sup>d</sup> *Isaiah lxvi. v. 21. Si mieux nous devons entendre ceci à tous les fideles élus d'entre les Gentiles, honorez de Dieu d'un Sacerdote Spirituel en sa maison, selon la privilege de la nouvelle alliance: etant d'ailleurs fort certain, que au nulle part de Nouveau Testament les Ministres d' l'Eglise ne sont appellés sacrificateurs, ou Levites. So on Jeremiah, Chap. xxx. v. 17. Par ce parole, & les suivantes — est icy montré la fermeté, & immutabilité de la Royauté, & Sacerdote de notre Seigneur J. Christ — lequel a en outre sous soi non seulement les pasteurs, & les docteurs de son Eglise, mais aussi tous les Membres d'elle, qu'il a tous faits Rois, & Sacrificateurs.*

## 224 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Christian Priesthood, to the Debasement, and Disparagement of the Gospel-dispensation, that they are *not Priests at all*: Whereas of the two, the Evangelical *Cobens*, or Ministers are the more proper and excellent Priests, who perform that in Substance, and Truth, which the Jewish did in the Shadow, and Letter. But if they are not *proper*, or *properly* Priests, then they are only *metaphorical* Priests, Priests in mere *Likeness*, but not in *Truth, and Reality*, as Love is *Fire*, and Knowledge *Light*, or a crafty Fellow a *Fox*, but are not *indeed* what they are called. In like manner according to this, and such late Writers, the Christian Ministers are not truly and really Priests, but only so called, because they have some resemblance with Priests, upon the account whereof they came to have the Name. But so a *painted* Man, and Star hath the Name of a Man, and Star; that is, they have a Name, but not the things signified by those Names. And therefore these Men, who deny Christian Ministers truly, and lawfully called, and ordained to be *proper Priests*, do as effectually deny the Verity, and reality of the Christian Priesthood, as the greatest Enemies of revealed Religion, and, like them, by consequence make our *Clement's, Irenau's, Tertullian's, and Cyprian's*, who were not Fools, notwithstanding all their Sanctity, and Sufferings, to have been Enthusiasts, or Knaves, and the Christian Priesthood which they taught to be such in Truth, to be in Truth nothing, but what is now, most impudently, and impiously called *Priestcraft*. Nay, they debase our Office as much as our Enemies do, and tho' not designedly, yet, I fear, with more Success, because their Testimony will sooner be believed against themselves by the People, before whom they will soon become contemptible, and base, by the just Judgment of God, as well as by the Consequences of their own Doctrine, by which in a manner they de-  
grade

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 225

grade themselves. But what do I say, *will soon become contemptible*? They are in a great degree so already, and have almost made their whole Order despicable by this false Doctrine, which hath helped so much to render the whole Clergy vile in the sight of the People. Did they themselves only feel the Effect of their Doctrine, it would not be Matter of such Complaint; but being thus false to their own Profession, and sapping the Ground upon which both it, and the Honour due unto it stands, they serve the Design of their, and their Lord's greatest Enemies, in exposing their Office to the Scorn and Hatred of the People, as a Mock-Priesthood, and themselves to their Contempt, as Mock-priests. As long as the People are taught the true Nature of the Christian Ministry, to be, as really it is, a true and proper Priesthood, and that their Ministers are true, and proper Priests, ordained by God, to stand before him as Advocates for them, and before them as his Oracles, to bless them in his Name; so long they will honour, and reverence them, as Priests; but when they are pleased to strip themselves of that part of their Character, and Relation to God, to which those Powers belong, and which above any other makes their Ministry, and them, as Church-Ministers, venerable, and holy, then they'll soon find the Veneration of the People begin to decay, and by degrees wear off into utter Contempt, when they have once laid aside the Notion of their being Orators, and Advocates, ordained by God to intercede with him for them; which, *Sir*, their Flocks can no longer retain, than they believe them to be *proper Priests*. Nay, what must they think of such Men who presume to act as their Orators, and Advocates with God, in presenting their Prayers to him, and making solemn Intercessions for them in a proper sacerdotal manner, and yet deny themselves to be *proper Priests*? I wish your, and other *such late*

*Writers*

## 226 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Writers* among the Clergy, would well consider this, and the Consequences of it, and then they would find themselves obliged to quit their Ministry, or own, and assert themselves to be truly, and properly sacerdotal Ministers, taken from among Men to minister in things pertaining to God: But neither are these, *Sir*, all the ill Consequences of this Doctrine, which must also tempt Clergy-men themselves, who believe it, to have a lower, and meaner Idea of their Ministry, and not to think their Order to be of that Dignity, and Holiness, and so *separate* from the World, as it is, and the ancient Christians believed it to be. They cannot have that Honour, and Reverence for it, as they themselves ought to have, if they do not believe it to be a true Priesthood, nor will they distinguish themselves so carefully, as it becomes Ministers of Christ, from other Men, by the singular Piety of their Lives, and the Gravity of their Garb, and Behaviour, if they do not believe themselves to be Priests. I doubt not, *Sir*, but that Latitude of Opinion among the Clergy in this point, is one of the Reasons, why so many Ministers of late are more than ever *secularized* in their Conversation, and without Reverence to themselves, conform themselves, and Families, to the sinful Fashions, and Vanities of the World, against which they ought to preach with one Mouth, and with the Zeal of a *Cyprian*, a *Basil*, a *Gregory*, an *Ambrose*, or *Chrysostom*, lift up their Voices, like Trumpets, and not spare the greatest of Men. This Secularity of the Clergy in complying with the excessive Vanities, and Lux of the Age, is so common in some places, that it is become a common subject of Discourse, but, as Men are affected, of a different kind. The sober among the Laity of both Sexes, who love the Clergy, deplore it, and the Vain themselves ridicule it, and despise, and expose the Clergy for it. Do you know, *Sir*, said one of the latter



latter sort to one of the former, that *Beau Clergyman* there with the long powder'd Wig, and the sparkling Ring? No, *Sir*, answer'd the other, nor do I desire to know any such, who forget how they are separated, and stand related to God, and their Flocks. Thus some with Grief lament, and many more deride the Clergy for the sinful *Airs* they give themselves in modish Vanities, even in the Church, as well as without. Is it not grievous to hear it said in Scorn, that we have a *well powdered Clergy*, not to mention other deserved Reproaches of them for the Secularity of their Families, as well as of themselves, to such a degree of Vanity, as can hardly proceed from any other cause, but their not believing, or forgetting themselves to be Priests, and their Relation to God, and the People, as such. Alas! *Sir*, do these Men think to convert Souls? or can they imagine that the People think that they themselves really believe what they preach, when their Compliance with the sinful Fashions of the World both in themselves, and in their nearest Relations is so great, that they look more like the vainest of Laymen, than Priests? But did they believe themselves to be Priests, and seriously reflect on their Characters, as such, they would soon live up more answerably to it; they would soon retrieve the ancient Reverence to the Priesthood, and recover that religious Respect which of old used to be paid to Christian Ministers, as *Priests*, and (pardon the Severity of the Expression, because it is the Apostle's) *recover themselves out of the Snare of the Devil*. To these *Gentlemen*, for so I now call them, because they affect the gentile *Airs* more than the Gravity of *Priests*, let me recommend that <sup>c</sup> Rule of St. *Augustin*, *Non sit notabilis habitus vester, nec affectatis vestibus placere, sed moribus* ——— *in incessu, statu, habitu, in omnibus motibus vestris, nil fiat, quod cu-*

---

<sup>c</sup> *Regula ad servos Dei 6.*

## 228 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*iniquam offendat adspēctum, sed quod vēstram deceat  
sanctitatem.*

To this Cause also it is chiefly to be ascribed, that Clergy-men so much neglect to teach the People *what* we are, or acquaint them with our relative Holiness, and with the Powers we have as Priests, and how beneficial our priestly Office, above all others, is to Mankind, and what Subjection, and Reverence is due to us, and our Authority upon those accounts. Indeed this Omission is not so bad (though bad enough) as to deny their Function to be a Priesthood, and themselves Priests, as *your late Writer* doth. But as it plainly proceeds from a sinful Latitude, Scepticism, and Neutrality: So is it of very ill consequence to the Souls of the People, and the Church of God. Fathers take care to preserve the Reverence due to them as *Fathers*, and Kings are never wanting in their Care to keep the People in a constant Sense of the Sacredness of Majesty, and the Obedience which is due to them as *Kings*; only we Priests, who are of greatest Concern to the World, are not careful to let the People know the Holiness of our Office as *sacerdotal*, and the Honour that is due to it, and that the Honour, and Obedience which is paid to it, as well as the Contempt of it, terminates in God. From this Cause also it proceeds, that Clergy-men so often value themselves more upon some other Character, or Account, than as the Ministers of God, and by their own Example teach the Laity to do so too. But did they believe themselves to be Priests, and to minister in the priestly Office under the eternal Anti-typal *Melchisedeck*, who is our High-priest, and Advocate in Heaven, standing continually before his Father for Men; did they believe that they are his Ministers in this, as well as his other Offices, and, consider, that it is really more honourable to be his Minister, than the Minister

ster of the greatest King, they would value themselves more upon their Priestly Character, and thereby teach their Flocks to do so too. And believe me, *Sir*, the People would soon learn to do it, when they saw them reverence themselves, and pay due regard to their own Character; they would most certainly follow their good Example, in giving them the same Respect they give themselves; and when they learnt from them, what was due to the priestly Character, they would reverence all Priests of the same Order alike; the Poorest as much as the Richest, those who were not Dignitaries of the Church, as much as those who are; there being really no greater Dignity imaginable, than to be a Priest. All other Differences between Priests of the same Order, are extrinsecal to the Honour, and Essence of the Priesthood, as to be Lord of a Manor, or a Lord of the Realm, or a Favourite at Court, or curiously learned, or a Writer of many Books, or to be very rich, or of noble Extraction, upon which Scores the World is apt enough to pay Respect to the *Man*, when they despise him as a Clergyman, because they understand not his Dignity, as a *Priest*.

XVI. *Sir*, I have enlarged more, than at first I thought, upon this Subject, to shew the Danger of this Doctrine, which denies Bishops, and Presbyters to be *proper Priests*, and the very ill Consequences, and Tendencies thereof. It tends, as you see, to the Dishonour and Depravation of the Clergy, the secularizing of their Manners, the debasing of them, and their Ministry, in the Esteem of the People, and every way to their utter Contempt, the Decay of Christian Piety, and Religion, and the Dissolution of the Church. In a word, it gratifies all her Enemies, and the Enemies of the Priesthood; and gives them infinite Advantage over the Clergy, particularly as to their

divine

## 230 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

divine Right to Tithes, which, I presume, your *late Writer*, who doth not think himself a Priest, must deny, and the most odious Charge which is laid upon them of Priestcraft. But, *Sir*, you are none of those Clergymen, who are false to their Profession, tho' you have given me this Occasion to consider the Doctrine of those, who unhappily are their own Enemies, and the ill Tendencies, and Effects thereof. On the contrary, as you believe your self to be a *proper Priest*: So have you lived up to your sacred Character in the exemplary Piety of your Life, the Gravity of your Garb, and Conversation, without disgracing, or betraying your Order, or the Church: Which would have been now in much better Condition, and more like the Church in the best, and purest Ages, were all the Clergy as true to it, and its Rights, as you are: I mean, the *original Rights*, which belong to it by the Laws of its High-priest, and Founder, and the Constitution of the Evangelical Theocracy, which is the Catholick Church. These Rights, *Sir*, which many have no Notion of, and which all those, who understand them, do not value as they ought, are nevertheless of highest Moment to the Well-being of the Church, and much to be preferred before all the Revenues, and temporal Liberties, with which pious Princes have endowed her. But were all the Clergy, or the generality of us, of your Mind, whatsoever is taken from her, would be restored, whatsoever is amiss would soon be reformed, and every thing wanting in her supplied. Were the Majority of us so affected, as you are, to her spiritual Interests, the supreme Interests of the Christian World, and preferred them before the little Interests of this Life, as not only the Priests, but the People ought to do, she would then indeed look like a *Theocracy*, or Royal Priesthood, like a *new Sion* indeed, like *Jerusalem* which came from above, and is free, and not like the Jewish *Jerusalem*.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 231

lem, which was in Bondage with her Children. But, *Sir*, alas! the whole Catholick Church in all Places groaneth together, and waiteth for the time, when she shall be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption, into the glorious Liberty of the Children of God.

---

### C H A P. III.

I. **H**AVING now, *Sir*, shewed, that it is not a good Argument to prove, that the Ministers, or *Liturgs* of the Church Christian are not Priests, or their Sacred Office, or Ministry is not a Priesthood, *because they are not so called in the New Testament*; and having also shewed, that 'tho' the Names of Priest, and Priesthood are not used for the Ministers, or Ministry of Christ therein, yet the things signified by those Names are there, and properly belong to them. I now, *Sir*, proceed in the last place to give you some Reasons, for which it may, without Presumption, be conjectured, why, or how it came to pass, that they are not called by those Names in the Writings of the New Testament, as *Messieurs de Geneve* object. Certainly, as <sup>e</sup> *Grotius* saith, *It was not without some Reason, that Christ, and his Apostles, forbore to call themselves so; or as he expresseth it, abstained from that way of speaking, to which they had a Right, tho' for some Reasons not expressed in the New Testament, they forbore to use it. That Christ might have called himself*

---

<sup>e</sup> *De imperio Summ. Potest. Cap. II. §. Ut autem pracones Novi Testamenti Sacerdotes speciatim appellantur, est quidem receptum antiquâ Ecclesiâ consuetudine, sed non de nihilo est, quod ab eo loquendi genere, & Christus ipse, & Apostoli semper abstinuerunt.*

## 232 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

[ἀρχιερεὺς, or ιερεὺς] *High-Priest, or Priest*, before his Ascension, or ordered his Apostles to have given him that Title immediately after it, your *late Writer* and his *Second* cannot deny ; but we do not read he ever took that Title upon him, or preached the Doctrine of his Priesthood, when he taught publicly in the Temple, or instructed his Disciples in private, or that he commanded his Apostles to preach of him by that Title, whom as we find in their Sermons to the People in the Book of their Acts, they set forth as a *King*, or *Lord*, and *Prophet*, and *Messiah*, but never as a *Priest*. Therefore (saith St. Peter at the end of his Sermon on the Day of Pentecost) *let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord, and Christ.* And so in his next Sermon, which he preached openly in the Temple to the People, who ran together unto him, and *John*, greatly wondering at the healing of the lame Man: *You have killed the Prince of Life*, saith he, *whom God hath raised from the dead* — And again, *For Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your Brethren like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things* — And every Soul that shall not hear that Prophet, shall be cut off from among the People. So in the Sermon which he preached before the Council, Acts v. *The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus, whom you slew, and hanged on a Tree, him hath God exalted with his own Right Hand to be a Prince, and a Saviour, to give Repentance to Israel, and Remission of Sins.* Thus they preached up his Authority, as *King*, and *Messias*, as the unbelieving Jews said of *Paul*, and *Silas* : *These do all contrary to the Decrees of Caesar, saying there is another King, one Jesus.* Yet we never read, that they said one word to them of his Priesthood, tho' he was the High-priest of our Profession, an High-priest of good things to come, our  
merciful

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 233

merciful, and faithful High-priest, who offered up himself by the eternal Spirit, whereby he obtained eternal Redemption for us, and afterwards once for all, entred with his own Blood into the Holy Place, to stand in the Presence of God for us, and make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People. But we do not find that this priestly Office of the Messias was taught expressly by any of the Apostles, till St. Paul taught it to the Jewish Christians of *Jerusalem*, and *Judea*, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, about 20 Years after his Conversion, and 30 after the Ascension of Christ. In like manner, tho' his Ministers were really, and truly Priests under him, and their Ministry a most true and proper ministerial Priesthood, after his Ascension, from whence we date the beginning of his Church; yet, as is objected, we read not in the New Testament that any of the Writers of it ever called *them* Priests, or *that* a Priesthood, or that they called *themselves*, or *it* by those Names, which (*non de nihilo erat*) was not without some Reason, as *Grotius*, no zealot for the Christian Priesthood, observes. Likely for the very same Reason, or Reasons, whatever they were, we do not find that any of the Houses where they met together for religious Worship, is call'd *ναός*, or in the Hellenistical Style *ἱερόν* a Temple, or *οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the House of God; for which we may also presume there was some Reason, why they abstained from that way of speaking, tho' in those Days God was wont to signify his Presence in the Places, which they set apart for his Worship, by as sensible Manifestations of his Presence, as ever he did in the Jewish Temple, as by shaking the Place where they were assembled, and the miraculous Effusions of the Holy Ghost. St. Paul when he had a fair Occasion for the use of one of those Words, seems studiously to decline it; as in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 22. There, faith he to the profane, and irreverent *Corinthians*, *First of all when ye come together* [*ἔν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*] *in the*

## 234 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

\* *Church, I hear there are Divisions among you—when you come together therefore into one place with such Dissentions among you, it is not to eat the Lord's Supper in that reverent manner, as you ought to do, But in your eating there, every one, as he cometh, taketh before others his own Supper, and so one, who is poor, and comes later, is hungry getting nothing, and another with his own Provision is drunken, i. e. eats, and drinks to excess. What, have you not Houses of your own to eat, and drink in, in this disorderly manner : or [τὸ ἐκκλησίας Θεῶν καὶ αὐτοφρογνῆτε] despise ye the Church of God ?*

This forbearance in the holy Penmen, to use the Greek Words for *Temple*, when they spoke of the Places appropriated to Christian Worship, as well as their long silence of our Saviour's Priesthood, and omitting in Greek to call his Ministers Priests, seems to proceed from one common Cause, *I mean*, from some regard they had to the Jewish Religion, which principally consisted in the Temple Oeconomy, and Priesthood, that was in being not only when our Lord, the Founder of the new *Sion*, and new *Jerusalem* was upon Earth, but was also to continue for some time after his Ascension, till the Destruction of the old Temple, and the old *Jerusalem*, which happened about 72 Years after his Birth, and 39 after his Ascension. Every one, who well considers this, will grant that there are apparent Reasons, why during that part of this Period, in which our Lord was conversant upon Earth, he would not declare himself to the Jews, to be the Antitype of their High-Priest, that is, to be a *Priest*, as well as a *King*, and *Prophet*. For first as a *Jew*, he was to observe the Law and the Temple Worship, and live in Communion with the *Jews*, which though he could

---

\* See Mr. Mede's Works. Vol. I. Book II. on 1 Cor. xi. 22. Card. Bona rerum Liturg. Lib. I. Cap. XIX.



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 235

do, as a King, and a Prophet; yet could he not do it with Congruity, had he declar'd himself to be their *sovereign Pontif*; that very High Priest, of which *Aaron* himself was but a Type, and Shadow. Secondly, they were willing to hearken to him as a Prophet, and as one that set himself up to be their King or Messias, whom they had long waited for; and under whom they expected not only that the Temple, and Temple-Worship should continue, but that it should be in greater Glory, than in the time of King *Solomon*. But had he taught them, that he was, or was to be the mystical *Melchisedeck*, Priest, as well as King, the prejudice of the People would have been too great to let them hearken to him. That Doctrine would have forthwith made them shut their Ears against his preaching, as much as the High Priest and Priests themselves did, and their Eyes against all his Miracles, as the Pharisees did, when they maliciously told him, that he cast out Devils by *Beelzebub* the Prince of the Devils. In like manner, when he first chose his twelve Disciples, and sent them out to preach the Kingdom of Heaven to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*, if instead of calling them his Apostles, or <sup>b</sup> *Missionaries* he had called them his *Priests*, they had indeed been sent forth, as Sheep among Wolves, who would have torn them in pieces, notwithstanding all their precautions of being wise as Serpents, and innocent as Doves. No Town, or Country of the Jews would have received them under that Character, and with that Doctrine, the preaching of which, and by consequence of another more spiritual Priesthood, and new *Jerusalem* to come, would have made them rise up against them as one Man; nor when they were per-

---

<sup>b</sup> Tertul. de Præscript. c. 20. Statim igitur Apostoli (quos hæc appellatio missos interpretatur) assumpto per sortem duodecimo Matthiæ, &c.

secuted in any one City, would they have found another, into which they could flee. This would have been their Lot with their Character of Priests, and the Doctrine of their Master's *High Priesthood*, unless it had pleased God by the Almighty Power of his Grace in a miraculous manner to take off the Veil from their hard Hearts; and of those Stones to raise up Seed unto *Abraham*.

II. And as he stiled them Apostles, and not Priests when he sent them forth to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*: So neither did he alter their Character after his Resurrection, no not at the time of his Ascension, when he solemnly sent them forth the second time into all the World *to preach the Gospel to every Creature*, tho' as many Learned Men think, he had made them Priests at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, and had performed part of his priestly Office in offering up himself upon the Cross for us, and was ready to perform the whole in ascending up to Heaven, to enter by his own Blood once into the holy Place not made with Hands, having obtained eternal Redemption for us. Nevertheless as there is not one Word of his Priesthood in this period of time, or in any Book of the New Testament written in it, but in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: So is there not one Word therein of their being Priests, but they were still called *Apostles*, a Character indeed of greatest Honour, and Authority, by which Christ gave them all the spiritual Power upon Earth, which he had received from the Father, as King, Prophet, and Priest. For as he was his Father's Apostle, and Plenipotentiary upon Earth: So they were his, as it is written, *John* xx. 21. Καθὼς ἂΠΙΕ'ΣΤΑΛΚΕ' με ὁ πατήρ κ' ἐγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς, which may be rendred, *as the Father hath made me his Apostle, so I make you mine*; for what is here expressed by πέμπω ὑμᾶς, is ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς, *Mat.* x. 16. yet, as I must observe again, tho' the sacerdotal Power

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 237*

Power, was one part of that Power, which was given him both in Heaven, and Earth, and tho' the Apostles were his Vicars, and Vicegerents in his Sacerdotal, as well as in his Kingly, and Prophetical Office, nevertheless they themselves continued in the old Title of Apostles after his Ascension, and in like manner gave to the different Orders of Ministers, whom they ordained for the Service of the Church, the Names of *Bishops*, and *Presbyters*, which were Names of Power to govern, and teach, and related to the Regal, and Prophetical Office of Christ, but in their signification did not directly connote him, as *Priest*. Saith Origen in his XVI<sup>th</sup> Homily upon *Joshua*, or *Jesus* the Son of *Nun* — *But because I am resolved to refer the things, which I shall say of Jesus (or Joshua) to our Lord, and Saviour, who is understood to be an Elder, and full of Years as he, who is the First-born of every Creature? Wherefore he alone, before whom none was, is truly, and entirely a Presbyter. Though therefore there are in the Scriptures who are called*<sup>i</sup> *Presbyters, or Priests; yet as the Lord Jesus among Priests is Chief Priest, and as among Pastors he is Chief Pastor; so among Presbyters, he is Chief of Presbyters, and among Bishops Chief of Bishops.* They were therefore under him, the <sup>k</sup> *Chief Priest*, subordinate ministerial Priests, as well as subordinate ministerial Presbyters, and Bishops under him, as Chief Presbyter, and Bishop. And let me add, they were subordinate Apostles under him, as the Chief Apostle; subordinate Pastors under him, as Chief Pastor, or Shepherd of our Souls; and subordinate Prophets, and Teachers, and Evangelists, under him as Chief Prophet, Teacher, and Evangelist, as *Nicodemus* said unto him, *Rabbi, we know thou art a Teacher come from God.* In like manner St. Ig-

---

<sup>i</sup> *Presbyteri vel Pontifices.*

<sup>k</sup> *Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. I. p. 37, 39. Epist. p. 800. Vol. I.*

## 238 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*narius*, whom I cited before, calls him the *Invisible Bishop*, and the Bishops upon Earth *visible Bishops*: So in the same way of reasoning, tho' they are not called Priests in the New Testament, yet they must have been *visible Priests* under him the *ἀρχιερεὺς* their *invisible Archetypal High-Priest*, and soon began to be so called by the Church of God after the Destruction of *Hierusalem*, at least within that period of time after it, in which St. *John* outlived all the other Apostles, and wrote his Revelation, and Gospel. *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, famous for his Learning, Piety, and Zeal as a Christian, who flourished towards the latter end of the second Century, in an <sup>1</sup> Epistle which he wrote in the sixty fifth Year of his Age, to the Bishop and Church of *Rome*, coming to mention St. *John* among the *Asian Worthies*, and *Luminaries* of the Church: *Moreover*, saith he, *John*, who lay in the Bosom of our Lord, who was a Priest, and wore upon the front of his Miter the holy golden Plate <sup>m</sup>, upon which was engraven Holiness to the Lord, *John*, who was also a Martyr, and Doctor, this *John* died in *Ephesus*. Sir, I have rendred the Greek Word *ιερεὺς* Priest, which is the literal signification of it, tho' here it should be translated an *High Priest*; for you know, Sir, *ιερεὺς* is often used for *ἀρχιερεὺς* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as *Priest* is often put for *High Priest* in the Old Testament; and accordingly St. *Hierom* translates the place thus: *Qui supra petus Domini recubuit, & Pontifex ejus fuit, auream Laminam in fronte gestans*, who lay in our Lord's Bosom, and was his High Priest, and wore the golden Plate on his Forehead. *Rufinus* translates it thus, *Qui fuit Summus Sacerdos, & pontificale ἱμάτιον ἔστυ*, Who was High Priest, and wore the

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. XXIV.

<sup>m</sup> Exod. xxviii. 36. xxxix. 30.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 239

pontifical golden Plate. And as for this Testimony of *Polycrates*, there is no reason to doubt of the Truth of it, because he lived so near the time of *St. John*, who died in or about the CIVth Year of the Christian Account ; or, as *St. Chrysostom* thinks, in the CXXth, for *Polycrates* wrote that Epistle in 196, which was the LXVth of his Age, and by consequence he was born in 131, which was but XXVII Years after *St. John's* Death, according to the first account of it, and but XI, according to the latter ; and being also his Successor in that See, after many others of his Family, he had Advantages, and Opportunities of informing himself of the truth of this matter ; and as he could not well be deceived, so neither would he deceive. You know, *Sir, Valesius* in his Notes on the place makes this Remark, viz. That *Polycrates* observes three things in the Praise of *St. John*. 1. That he was High Priest. 2. That he was a Martyr. And, 3. That he was a Doctor, or Evangelist ; and therefore as he was the Martyr and Evangelist of Christ ; so must he be understood to have been his Priest. And as for wearing the golden Plate on the Front of his Mitre, as a Badge of his pontifical Office, *Epiphanius* writes the same thing of *St. James*, the Brother of our Lord, and first Bishop of *Hierusalem*, but by mistake, as *Petavius* thinks. But were it true, it would give a good account why the ° High Priest of that time, with the Scribes, and Pharisees, taking advantage of the Death of *Festus* the Roman Governor, before the Arrival of *Albinus* his Successor, when there was an Anarchy in *Jerusalem*, full of Rage, and

---

° Quod de *Johanne Evangelista* testatum reliquit *Polycrates* apud *Eusebium*, Lib. V. Cap. XXXIII. ὁς ἐϋκρίθη ἱερὰς τὸ πύταλον προσοικνῶς. de *Jacobo* haud scio, an quisquam prodiderit. Nam quos haeresi XXIX. citat [*Eusebium*, *Clementem*] *Epiphanius*. de *Johanne*, non *Jacobo* ista scripserunt. *Petavius* ad haeres. LXXVIII. Vol. II. p. 333.

• *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. II. XXIII.*

more

## 240 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

more like a Rabble, than a *Council* hurried him without Trial to the top of the Temple, from whence they threw him down; and because he did not die upon the Spot, one of them, as he was praying for them, brain'd him with a Fuller's Club. But to return from this Digression about *James* the Just, to what *Polycrates* saith of *St. John*; as our blessed Lord could not have been a *Priest* to his Father at the writing of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, unless he had been so before: So neither could *St. John* have been his Ministerial Priest, when he was Bishop of *Ephesus*, unless he had been so before, even from the beginning of the Christian Church, though he is not so called either in his own, or any other Writings of the New Testament.

This Forbearance in the Apostles, Bishops, and Presbyters, to take upon them the *Sacerdotal Title*, or to style themselves *Priests* in their Writings after our Lord's Ascension is *secondly* to be referred to the regard they had, and were to have to the *Jewish Religion*, which, as I said before, principally consisted in the Temple Oeconomy, and Priesthood, with which none of their Doctrines were so inconsistent, as that of their being Priests. They knew the Temple-Worship was to continue to the Destruction of *Hierusalem*; and that in the mean time it was to be decently treated by them, and as they had still a Right to the Temple, and owned the God of the Temple: So they were obliged by the Will of their Lord, and all the Rules of Religious Prudence to comply as far, as they could consistently with preaching up *Jesus*, with the Temple-Worship, and the Law of *Moses*, that thereby they might more easily convert the *Jews*; and when they were converted, keep them firm in their Communion from relapsing to Judaism again. For the *Jewish Christians* were wont to continue Zealots of the Law after their Conversion, as you may see in *Acts* xxi.

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 241

where *James* the Apostle, and Bishop of *Hierusalem* told *Paul*, that of the many Thousands of *Jews*, who believed they were all zealous of the Law. This, *Sir*, was 25 Years after the Ascension of Christ. In which time if *St. James*, for instance, had preached up himself to be the Ministerial High-Priest of *Jerusalem* under *Jesus* our High Priest in Heaven, over the House of God, it would have been a much greater Offence both to the believing, and unbelieving *Jews*, than it was in *St. Paul* to teach the Convert *Gentiles* not to circumcise their Children, or walk after their Rites, and Customs, but to forsake the Law of *Moses*. As long therefore, as it was necessary for them to comply with the Temple-Worship, and the *Mosaical* Observances: So long it was inconsistent for them to own themselves for Priests, because their Ministerial Priesthood upon Earth, as well as the Priesthood of *Jesus* in Heaven upon which it depended, was a Priesthood opposite to that of the Temple, and could not at the first preaching of it but be so understood by the believing, as well as the unbelieving *Jews*, and have equally enraged them both against the Apostles, as Men who had a design to set up another Altar, and another Priesthood, and another Temple-Oeconomy against *Moses*, and the Law. To what degree this would have offended them, and what the Effects of that Offence would without a Miracle have been, may be seen in the xxii<sup>d</sup> Chapter of *Joshua*, from the History of the great Altar of Witness, which the Children of *Reuben*, and *Gad*, and the Half-Tribe of *Manasseh* built by *Jordan*, which the Children of *Israel* thinking was erected in Opposition to the Altar of the Sanctuary at *Shilo*, gathered themselves together there to go up to War against them, that they might destroy them. So they presently destroyed *St. Stephen* upon the Evidence of false-Witnesses, whom, because they could not resist the Spi-  
rit

## 242 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

rit of Wisdom, by which he spake, they suborned false Witnesses to testify, that they heard him speak blasphemous Words against God, and *Moses*, and against the Temple, and the Law. It therefore highly concerned the Apostles to conceal the Doctrine of their own, and their Lord's Priesthood, as a Mystery, which yet neither believing, or unbelieving *Jews* were prepared to receive. On the contrary, they were obliged to all prudential Compliances, and Condescensions to their Weakness, and to Judaize, as much as lawfully they could, that they might gain the *Jews*. Thus the Apostles, and their first Profelytes, whom St. *Peter* converted on the Day of *Pentecost*, continued daily with one accord in the Temple praising God, and having Favour with all the People, which they could not have had without such Compliances, by which they made such additional Conversions to the Church, as they could not have made, had they pretended to be *Priests*. We read in the fifth Chapter of the *Acts*, that out of *Hierusalem*, and the Countries round about it, Believers were more, and more added to the Lord, Multitudes both of Men, and Women; and in the sixth Chapter, that the Word of God still encreased, and that the Number of Believers was greatly multiplied in *Hierusalem*, and that a great number of the *Priests* were also obedient to the Faith. I believe, Sir, you'll grant that these in all appearances would not easily have come over to the Church, had the Apostles declared themselves to be *Priests*; which they could not well have done, without preaching up *Jesus*, whom the *Jews* were content to believe in as King, and *Messias*, to be their High-Priest. Indeed we do not read in the *Acts* that St. *James*, or any of the Apostles, preached or prayed in the Temple after the Persecution in which St. *Stephen* the first Martyr suffered, till we come to the twenty first Chapter; where he and the Elders persuaded St. *Paul* to comply with the Jewish Christians



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 243

Christians in going up to the Temple with some Brethren, who had a *Nazarite's* Vow upon them, to purifie themselves, *that is*, to offer all the Sacrifices, and perform all the other Rites of the *Jewish* Religion, which are described in the sixth Chapter of *Numbers*, from the thirteenth to the twenty first Verse. But it is not probable, that they would have persuaded St. *Paul* to Judaize in this solemn piece of Temple-Worship, had they not in the mean time gone themselves thither. Their Forbearance so long for about two or three and twenty Years would have made the *Jewish* Brethren jealous of St. *James* their Bishop, and suspect that he also, as well as St. *Paul*, was a Forsaker of *Moses*, and his Law. It is much more reasonable to believe they continued their Compliances in going up to worship at the Temple, as far as they could do it with Safety, in Times free from Persecution, as in that Interval of Quiet after the Martyrdom of St. *Stephen*, <sup>p</sup> when the Churches had rest throughout all Judæa, and Samaria, and Galilee, and were edified in walking in the Fear of the Lord, and in the Comfort of the Holy Ghost were multiplied. So had it Peace again after the Death of *Herod Agrippa*, who to gratifie the Jews, persecuted the Apostles at *Hierusalem*, and killed *James* the Brother of *John* with the Sword; for after he was smitten by the Angel of the Lord, it is said, that the Word of God grew, and multiplied, Acts xii. 24. After this, we have no farther account of Matters relating to the Church of *Hierusalem*, but of the Council of the Apostles, and Elders, who met there to determine, how far the Gentile Christians were obliged to keep the Law of *Moses*, and of St. *Paul's* going thither from *Casarea* in the twenty first Chapter, which I mentioned before, and which happened in the twenty fifth Year after Christ's Ascension, and

---

<sup>p</sup> Acts ix. 31.

## 244 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

about two, or three Years before the Martyrdom of *St. James*, who frequented the Temple to the last, into which he of all the Christians, was for his most eminent and superlative Sanctity of Life permitted to enter, and pray, as *Hegeſippus* in <sup>9</sup> *Eusebius* writes, and there was he found when he was apprehended, *interceding with God* for the Sins of the People upon his Knees; which by long and frequent kneeling on the Ground in Prayer, were become as hard as those of a Camel. The same regard they were to shew to the Jewish Religion at *Jerusalem*, obliged them also in all other Cities, and Countries, where the Jews had Synagogues, to Judaize as much as it was lawful for Men to do, who preached *Jesus* to be the *Messias*, that they might the more easily convert the Jews, and Jewish Profelytes, as at *Antioch* in <sup>1</sup> *Pisidia*; in which place *Barnabas*, and *Paul* went into the Synagogue, where after the reading of the Law, and the Prophets, the Rulers of the Synagogue sent to them to tell them, if they pleased they might preach to the People. I cannot think they would have invited them to preach, unless they had joined with them in their Synagogue-Worship, as looking upon their Brethren the Jews wherever they came as one People of God with themselves, and within the same Covenant of Grace, till they rejected, and blasphemed *Jesus*, whom they preached; and then, as our Lord commanded them, when he first sent them forth to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*, they broke off Communion with them, and shook off the Dust of their Feet against them, as *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* did against the contradicting and blaspheming part of that Syna-

<sup>9</sup> Lib. XI. Cap. xxiii. Τὸ τὸ μόνον ἦλθον εἰς τὰ Ἰσραὴλ ἐστίν  
ἐν μόνῳ εἰς ἡμέραν εἰς τὸν λαόν, &c. See also the Animadversions  
of *Petavius* against *Scaliger*, in his Notes on *Haref.* lxxviii. of *Epi-*  
*phanius*, Tom. XI. p. 332.

<sup>1</sup> Acts xiii. 15.

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 245*

gogue, as a Sign of the Destruction, which should overtake them. But many of them, *Jews* and *Jewish* Proselytes, followed *Paul*, and *Barnabas*, which there is no reason to believe they would have done, had they preached a Truth so inconsistent with their Religion, as that there was an Evangelical Altar, and Priesthood among the Christians, which was to succeed to the Altar, and Priesthood of the Temple, and that *Moses* was to give place to Christ. The like Success they had in the *Synagogue at Iconium*, where, saith the Text, *they so spake, that a great Multitude both of the Jews, and also of the Greeks believed.* What I have said here of the Compliance of the Apostles with the *Jews*, is plain from the Words of *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. ix. 20. *Unto the Jews I became as a Jew* [in observing the *Jewish* Rites, and Ceremonies] *to them who are under the Law, as* [if I also were] *under the Law.* And what he did, no doubt, but the rest of the Apostles, and Evangelists likewise did.

IV. But in the third place, as the Apostles out of regard to the *Jews*, whom they considered as one peculiar People of God with themselves, till they resisted their Doctrine, and Miracles, did Judaize in the Temple, and Synagogues, and forbear in great compassion to their Weakness to acquaint them with the great Mystery of the Evangelical Altar and Priesthood, that they might more easily convert them: So it is very probable they also concealed it from them by our Lord's Direction; it being very agreeable to the Wisdom of God to conceive, that he would not have *two Priesthoods* openly set up in the same place, or as I may say, in the same Church at one time. The *Jewish* Priesthood was of Divine Institution, as well as the Christian, and as it became the infinite Wisdom of our Lord, to bid his

---

<sup>†</sup> Acts xiv. 1.

## 246 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

Apostles tarry at *Jerusalem*, and wait there for the promise of the Father, before they entred upon their Apostolical Office: So might it become him to forbid them to preach, or set up the latter, till the former was put down; because two *opposite Priesthoods*, and two *opposite Altars* appearing among one People, would have wrought great Distraction and Confusion, when it could be truly affirmed by both sides, that both were from God. God, saith the Apostle, *is not the Author of Tumult and Confusion, but of Peace, and Order*; and therefore we may without presumption believe, that it was his Will that the New Priesthood should not be promulged, nor its New Altar erected publickly in every Place, till the appointed Time came when the Old Priesthood with the Temple, and its Altar were to be destroyed. The New *Jerusalem* was not to be compleat, till Old *Jerusalem* was laid waste. Before that it was only in *Fieri*, but after it was in *Facto esse*, and then the Christian Priesthood and Altar became the only Priesthood, and Altar in the World of Divine Erection, when they were left alone, and were no longer opposite to the *Jewish* Priesthood, and Altar, which were then no more. But had the Christian Priesthood, and Altar been set up publickly, and in form before this Period, there had been in appearance Altar against Altar, and Priesthood against Priesthood in publick view, and one Divine Institution pleadable against the other, which would have distracted the Worshippers of the one true God, the God of the Jews, and brought forth Strife, Envy, and Distraction, and every evil Work. This was so detestable in the Eyes of the Heathens, that they could never endure two different Altars, or the Appearance of two different Altars to one God; and therefore all Colonies were wont to

<sup>2</sup> *Dodiff. & Nobiliss. Ezech. Sphanhemii dissert. nona de praestantia & usu Numism.* Edit. fol. Lond. p. 573, &c.



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 247

build their Temples and Altars after the same Form, and make the Images of their Gods after the same Likeness that they were built, and made in the Mother Cities, lest they should seem to set up opposite Temples, and Altars. It was therefore very agreeable to the Wisdom of our Lord, and Law-giver, to command his Apostles to abstain from all Appearance of Schism by two Priesthoods, till this time, or the times near it, when there were no more Hopes of converting the obdurate and blasphemous *Jews* now ripe for Destruction. If it be objected, that this is all precarious, because it is no where written in the New Testament that our Lord gave any such Order; I answer, *first*, that as he " did many Miracles in the Presence of his Disciples, which are not written: " So he spoke, and did many other things, which likewise are no where written; and which if they had been written every one, would have made a World of Books. *St. Paul* cites one of his Sayings, which is no where else recorded, that *it is more Blessed, or Heroical for a Christian, to give than to receive.* But *secondly*, considering the Fact is plain, that the Christian Priesthood was kept so long secret, it is not precarious, or presuming to ascribe it to a Direction, or Order of our Lord, for the Reasons given, till a better Cause can be assigned.

V. *Thirdly*, Considering the Apostles, who never called themselves, or other Ministers *Priests*, could not but understand the Will of their Lord, we may presume they forbore that Title, for the prudential Reasons above given, by his Allowance, or Permission, if not by his Direction, and then the Difference between Permission, and Direction in a Supreme Law-giver being not very great, it is not so precarious to resolve their Practice into the latter,

---

" John xx, 30.

" John xxi. 25.

## 248 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

rather than the former, since doing, or forbearing to do a thing by the Direction, or Permission of a Superiour, are both according to his Will. The *Jewish* Proselytes at their first coming over to Christianity, and sometime after, thought of nothing less, than a Dissolution of the Temple-Priesthood, and Altar. On the contrary they thought, that the House of Christ was but a Superstructure upon the House of *Moses*, but never imagined it was to be the Destruction thereof. Hence they expected, that the *Gentile* Proselytes to the Messias should be Circumcised, and observe the Law, as becoming Members of the *Jewish* Church, in which they still reputed themselves to be, and to be obliged while the Temple stood, to observe the *Jewish* Rites. This, not to mention the Epistle of St. *Barnabas*, is so plain from the fifteenth Chapter of the *Acts*, and the Epistles of the Apostle to the *Romans*, and *Galatians*, that I need not insist upon the proof of it. And St. *Paul*, so far complied with their Opinion, as to circumcise *Timothy*, that he might not offend the *Jews* at *Derbe*, *Lystra*, and *Iconium*, who knew him to be the Son of a *Greek*. This was done about seventeen Years after Christ's Ascension, and I mention it to shew, that these, and such like Compliances of the Apostles with the believing *Jews*, are in like manner, as I have said of their Forbearance to call themselves Priests, to be ascribed to the Direction, or at least to the Permission of our Lord, which I suppose, Sir, your late Writer will not think fit to deny. I am so much of this Opinion, that I believe they suffered the convert Priests to minister in their Priestly Office, when they could do it with Safety to themselves, and without having Fellowship with their unbelieving Brethren, who rejected Christ. For after their Conversion the *Jews* had the same right, as before, to have Communion with the God of the Temple, and to be  
partakers

*The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 249

partakers of his Altar, where they might still offer, and eat as *Jews*, so they did not do it in Society with their disobedient Brethren; who, as *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* said unto those at *Antioch* in *Pisidia*, put the Word of God from them, and made themselves unworthy of everlasting Life. The Completion of the Covenant was not in the unconverted, but in the converted *Jews*; they, as *Christians*, were the true Heirs of the Promise among that People with the converted *Gentiles*, and the Covenant which God made with their Father *Abraham*, was with them, and them only of all the *Jewish Nation*, and as his believing Children, they more especially had a right to the Temple, and Altar of God, as long as they were in Being. To this purpose speaks *St. Barnabas* in his Epistle, \* *Be not like to them, who heaping up their Sins, say that their Covenant is ours. Whereas it is ours only, for they [by their unbelief] have for ever lost that, which Moses received.* So Chapter x. Let us see, then, whether this [unbelieving] People, or the former be Heirs according to the Promise, and the Covenant be with us, or them. So in the same Chapter, And *Jacob* said unto *Joseph*, I know it, my Son, I know it; but the Elder shall serve the Younger, though he shall also be blessed. You see then whom he hath appointed, that they should be the first People, and Heirs of the Covenant, and what also if God hath mentioned this by *Abraham*? Then we have the Perfection of Knowledge. What then, saith he to *Abraham*, because thou hast believed, it is imputed unto thee for Righteousness, behold I have set thee for a Father of the Nations, which by uncircumcision believe in the Lord. Let us therefore enquire whether God hath fulfilled the Covenant, which he swore to our Fathers, that he would give this People? Truly

## 250 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

he gave it, but they were not worthy to receive it for their Sins; and a little after, Moses therefore received them, but they were not worthy, now then learn, how we have received them. But the Lord himself hath given them unto us, that we might be the People of his Inheritance. All this he said to bring the Christian Jews to a right understanding of the Gospel, for till this time and <sup>y</sup> after, they were zealous of the Law, thinking not only themselves, but the Christian Gentiles obliged to observe it, as is plain from what follows. <sup>z</sup> In this therefore, Brethren, God was foreseeing, and merciful to us, because the People whom he hath purchased by his Beloved, was to believe in Simplicity, and therefore he shews things to us, that we should not run, as Proselytes to their Law. But to return from this short Digression, such was the Weakness of the Christian Jews, which obliged the Apostles to so much Compliance, and Forbearance with them, and more particularly, as I hope I have made it appear very probable, in not taking their Titles from the Temple, I mean the Title of Priests upon them, or giving it to others, whom they made Bishops, and Presbyters, while the Temple, and Temple-Priesthood were in Being. But tho' during that Period, they are not expressly called Priests, yet they are called so implicately, and by Intimation, as by St. Peter, who told the Christian Jews of the Asian Dispersion, that in their Christian State they were a Royal Priesthood, or Kingdom of Priests. So, as is shew'd above, St. Paul told those of Judea, and Jerusalem, that the Christians had an Altar, or Altar-Sacrifice offered by Priests, whereof Unbelievers who served at the Tabernacle, had no Right to eat. So I have shew'd how St. Clement in his Epistle to the Corinthians, using the definition for the *definitum*, called their

<sup>y</sup> See Ignatius's Epist. ad Magnes.

<sup>z</sup> Cep. ii.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 251

Ministers <sup>a</sup> πρεσβύτεροις τὰ ὄντα, Offerers of Gifts, or Sacrifices, that is *Sacerdotes*, as the *Italian*, and *Spanish*, or *Sacrificers*, or *Pontiffs*, as all the *French* Versions translate the *Greek*, and *Hebrew* Words for *Priest*. I have also shew'd it from many other Fathers, and from the most ancient Form of Consecration of a Bishop which is in *Const. Apost.* Lib. viii. cap. v. and in the *Baroccian* MS of *Hippolytus* entitled Διατάξεις τῶν Ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων περὶ χειροτονιών, both which agree in their Testimony, as to this Point.

VI. Wherefore in the next place let me farther observe, that latter Church-writers use Words, and Phrases, which do not occur in the former. So *Dionysius Alex.* observes in <sup>b</sup> *Eusebius* that St. *John* uses many peculiar Words, and Expressions, that were not in use before, as in the beginning was the *Logos*, &c. and the *Logos* was made *Flesh*, &c. and that which we have seen, heard, and handled of the *Logos* of *Life*; to which he adds his use of τὸ ζῶν, τὸ Φῶς, ἀπολεγοντὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, and some others, which he saith he used against the Hereticks of his time, who denied that Christ was come in the *Flesh*. These he called *Antichrists*, and *Antichrist*, Words which we do not find in the Writings of the other Apostles. By which we may see, that the Church might have occasion to use Terms in after-times, which she did not use before, and particularly when she was arrived to a perfect, and settled Oeconomy, in *facto esse*, she might think fit to give Names to her Ministers, from which she abstained before.

Thus after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, or when it was near, she might begin to use the Word *Priest*, or use it more familiarly, than before. So we are sure from *Eusebius*, that before St. *John* died, the ἀγία θη μέγαν κυριακή, the Anniversary, Festi-

<sup>a</sup> See *Cotelerius's* Note on the Place.

<sup>b</sup> *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. VII. Cap. xxv.

## 252 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

val of our Lord's Resurrection was called the *Pascha*, or *Passover*, by the ancient Christians, though it is not so called in the Writings of the New Testament. And from <sup>d</sup> *Ignatius*, that the Church of Christ dispersed through the World, was called the *Catholick Church*, and the Oblations of Bread, and Wine in the holy Eucharist *the Mysteries*, though the Church is not once called *Catholick*, nor the *Lord's Supper* a *Sacrament*, or *Mystery*, in the whole Book of the New Testament. So κυριακή ἡμέρα, *the Lord's Day*, is used for the weekly Festival of our Lord's Resurrection in the *Revelation* of St. John, but is not found in any other Writings of the New Testament, where it is only call'd the first Day of the Week. So tho' in *Antioch* the Followers of Christ, who before were called *Nazarites*, and *Galileans*, came after the *Greek* Fashion to be first called *Christians* from the Name of their Master Christ: Yet neither any of the Writers of the New Testament, or any other of the Apostolical Age call them by that Name, or our Religion Christianity, or the Christian Religion. St. *Luke* in his History of the <sup>e</sup> *Acts* tells us, that King *Agrippa* said unto *Paul*, *Almost thou perswadest me to be a Christian*; but St. *Paul* seems to decline the Name in his Answer, saying, *I would to God, that not only thou, but also all, who hear me this Day, were both almost, and altogether such, as I am, except these Bonds*. In his Epistles he never saith *Paul* an Apostle to the Christians, or Christian Church at such a Place, but to the beloved of God, the Church of God, the Saints, and the faithful Brethren; which are all

<sup>c</sup> Eccles. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. xxiv.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. ad Smyrn.

<sup>e</sup> Δὲν ὅτι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὄντας μυστηρίων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, &c. Epist. ad Trall. Uffer; or else *Mυστηρίων* may here signifie both the Mysteries, or Sacraments of the Church, *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*, neither of which is called a *Mystery*, or *Sacrament* in the New Testament.

<sup>f</sup> Chap. xxvi. 28.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 253

common Jewish Expressions, that did not distinguish the Christians by Name, as a Sect. St. James, when he wrote to the converted Jews of the Dispersion, inscribes his Epistle not to the *Christian Jews*, or *Jewish Christians*, but to the *Twelve Tribes* scattered abroad. And St. Peter inscribes his first Epistle to them, To the Strangers, or Sojourners scattered throughout *Portus, Galatia, &c.* And the second is address'd to them in this Circumlocution, *to them who have obtained like precious Faith with us*, as if it then were a private Rule of the Church not to call themselves by a Characteristical Name, which would have distinguished them, and offended the other Jews. St. Ignatius, St. John's Disciple, Bishop of *Antioch*, is the first Ecclesiastical Writer, in whom we find those Names, who in his Epistle to the *Magnesians* hath these Words, *πρέπον ἐν ὅσῳ μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι χριστιανὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι*, it is therefore fitting that we should not only be called Christians, but be so indeed, and *ὅθεν τὸτο μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἡρώδης μαθωνῶν καὶ χριστιανισμὸν ζῆν*, wherefore being his Disciples, let us learn to live according to the Christian Religion. And again, *ὁ γὰρ χριστιανισμὸς ἐκ αἰς ἰσθαισμὸν ἐπέστυεν*, &c. For the Christian Religion was not converted to the Jewish, but the Jewish to the Christian Religion. Wherefore if it be asked why St. John, who lived long after the Destruction of Jerusalem, neither called himself, nor the Bishops, and Presbyters of the Churches to whom he wrote Priests? I answer first, It may as well be asked why he did not call the People of those Churches Christians, or their Profession Christianity by Name, as his Scholar Ignatius did? He wrote his Book of *Revelation* about twenty six Years after the fatal Period of the old Jerusalem, and the Temple-worship, and his Gospel about eight Years after it, and yet in neither of them doth he call the Disciples of Christ *Christians*; nor, what is yet  
more

## 254 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

more observable, doth he say one Word in either of them, or in his Epistles, of the Priesthood of Christ, tho' in his Book of *Revelations* he again, and again describes him in a most majestic Style, as King. And as the Doctrine of his Priesthood was then undoubtedly the Doctrine of the Church, tho' he makes no mention of it: So his Disciples were then Christians, tho' he doth not call them so. In like manner the Bishops, and Presbyters of the Church were then without doubt esteemed Priests, though he omits the Name. And so no doubt before he died, in the beginning of the Second Century, the Names of Bishops, and Presbyters, which before had been used in common, and indifferently, were then used differently in distinct Senses to signify the <sup>2</sup> two holy Orders, as in all the Epistles of his Disciple; so weak an Argument is this negative Argument against any thing, which was the general Belief, and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church; and by consequence against the true Christian Ministers being proper Priests, because they are not expressly so called in the Writings of the New Testament.

But *Secondly*, as to this Objection from St. John's not calling them Priests, in the Books which he wrote after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, I answer, That in his Gospel, which he wrote last of all, but a little before his Death, he had no Occasion to call the Apostles *Priests*, because he doth not continue his History of Jesus till the time, when they began to gather, and form Churches, which was not till after Christ's Ascension. But in his Book of *Revelations*, which is a prophetic Book, he calls the Ministers of the Church Priests, in such Figures, and Similitudes, and Allusions as are proper to the prophetic Style, and in such

---

\* See *Cotelerius* upon the Place.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 255

Representations of one thing for another, as belong to that sublime way of Writing, in which Visions use to be expressed. Thus because Christians were the mystical *Israel*, in whom the Covenant, and all the Promises were accomplished, he calls them *Jews*, Chap. ii. 9. and iii. 9. where he saith, *I know the Blasphemy of them, who say they are Jews, and are not.* In the same place he calls the false heretical Christians, and their Churches, the Synagogues of Satan, often using Prophetical, and Jewish Words, and ways of speaking, in things relating to Christians, and the Christian Church. So by the Name of Heaven is often signified the Christian Church, and by the Temple-worship, and Ceremonies, the Devotions of Christians, and to come to my Point, by Angels are often denoted *Priests*, because of the likeness of their Offices. <sup>b</sup> For as Angels are all Spirits, who minister unto God in Heaven, so his Priests minister unto him upon Earth. And as *Angels* were wont to be sent with Messages, and on Embassies from God to Men, so his *Priests* are his *Angels*, or rather *εὐαγγελισται*, his good Angels, or Messengers, who are sent to preach in his Name the Gospel unto Men; and, as the Apostle speaks, to be the *Ambassadors of Christ*, to beseech them in his stead to be reconciled unto God. The Words in the Original are *ὡς χεῖρ πρεσβύτου*, and so in *Ephes. vi. 20.* *ὡς ὁ πρεσβύτης*, for which (saith he, speaking of the Mystery of the Gospel) *I am an Ambassador in Bonds.* An Ambassador, i. e.

---

<sup>b</sup> Chrysost. de Sacerd. Lib. III. ἡ δὲ ἱερουργία τῆς γῆς, &c. The Priesthood indeed, is administered upon Earth, but is of the Order of things in Heaven. For it is neither Man, nor Angel, nor Arch-angel, nor any created Power that ordained \* this Hierarchy, but the Holy Ghost, who hath taught mortal \* or reinke Men to imagine they have the † Ministry of Angels. † ἀρχαγγελίας. And therefore it behoves a Priest to be as pure, as if he were among those Potentates in Heaven.

## 256 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

a Messenger, an Angel, a Preacher; for you know, Sir, how *πρεσβυς*, and *πρεσβυτης* in the Greek Tongue is glossed <sup>1</sup> by *ἀγγελος*, and how near akin it is in its signification to <sup>2</sup> *κήρυξ* a Preacher, Publisher, or Promulger; so that it is not without great Agreement in their respective Offices, that Priests are called *Angels*, who are sent from God [*ἐκπεύσαντες, καὶ εὐαγγελίζαντες*] to publish the best Doctrine, and most happy, joyful News, that Men ever heard, or received. The Sacrifices, which the Greeks offered upon receiving good News were called <sup>3</sup> *εὐαγγέλια*, and the Gifts, and Presents which they gave to Messengers of good News, they also called <sup>4</sup> *εὐαγγέλια*, the very Word by which the Holy Ghost hath chosen to express the Gospel, the joyful Tidings of Salvation, as it is called by the Apostle, saying, *How shall they preach, except they be first sent, as it is written of us, how beautiful are the Feet, or Coming of them, who <sup>5</sup> preach the Gospel of Peace, and bring glad Tidings of good things?* The Office then of Christian Priests is the very same with that of the Angel, which first preached the Gospel to the Shepherds, saying, *Behold I bring you good Tidings of great Joy, which shall be to all People, for unto you is born this Day in the City of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord.* Upon which that Angel, and many others, even a Multitude of the Heavenly Host praised God, saying: *Glory be to God in the highest, and on Earth Peace, good Will towards Men.* Such Congruity there is in the Office of Angels, and Christian Priests. They are both

<sup>1</sup> ὁ δὲ πρεσβυτης, εἰν ἄν καὶ ἀγγελος.

<sup>2</sup> Ὅθεν εἰρη, καὶ κήρυξι, καὶ πρεσβείᾳ χρηματίζαν. Jul. Pollux. Lib. VIII. cap. xi. Segm. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Jul. Pollux. Lib. V. Cap. xlv. Segm. 129.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Lib. VI. Cap. xi. Segm. 187.

<sup>5</sup> Ἐὐαγγελιστοὺς ἀποστόλους, ἢ εὐαγγελιστοὺς ἀποστόλους τὰ ἀπαθλ. God's

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 257

God's ° *Liturgs*, or Ministers ; they are both his Ambassadors, Messengers, and Preachers sent forth to Men, and to minister among Men for them, who are Heirs of Salvation. And upon the Account of this excellent Angelical sort of Ministry, I may suppose it was, that this Title was given in special manner to the Chief Priest, and under him to the Priests, who ministred to God in the Temple under the Old Testament, as in *Malachy xi. 7.* *The Priests Lips should preserve Knowledge ; for he is the Messenger, or Angel of the Lord of Hosts.* So our Christian Prophet in the beginning of the viii<sup>th</sup> Chapter representing the things of the Church on Earth by things in Heaven : *There was Silence (saith he) in Heaven about the space of half an Hour, and I saw seven Angels, who stood before God, and to them were given seven Trumpets, and another Angel came and stood at the Altar, having a golden Censer ; and there was given unto him much Incense, that he should offer it with the Prayers of the Saints upon the golden Altar, which was before the Throne, and the Smoke of the Incense, which came with the Prayers of the Saints ascended up before God out of the Angel's hand.* By the Prayers of the Saints all Interpreters here agree is signified the Prayers of all faithful Christians, as in Chap. v. 8. where it is said, *The four living Creatures and twenty four Presbyters fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them Harps,*

---

° Ο ποιῶν τὰ ἀγγέλους αὐτῷ ἐνδύματα, καὶ τὰ λιβανητῆς αὐτῷ πρὸς θρόνον. Heb. i. 7. Sacerdotes dona seu munera duo offerunt, preces fidelium, Sacrificia incruenta, sanctam Eucharistiam, &c. Coteler. in Cap. xiv. i. Epist. S. Clementis ad Cor. Grotius on Malach. ii. 7. Quia Angelus Domini, &c. Angeli preces hominum ad Deum, dei mandata ad homines deferunt. Idem faciebat in lege summus Sacerdos, Levit. xvi. i. Deut. xvii. 9. Ejus locum implet in Christiana Ecclesia Episcopus, Angelus ob id ipsum dictus in Apocalypsi. Diodorus Siculus de Judæis apud Photium. Ἀγγέλους τῶν προσευχόμενων, καὶ νομιζομένων αὐτοῖς ἀγγέλων ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸ θεὸς προσευχόμενον.

and

## 258 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and golden Phials full of (Incense or) Odours, which are the Prayers of the (Christian) Saints. So by the Angel is represented the chief Minist'ring Priest, or Bishop in every Church, who offered up their Prayers, all in Allusion to the Jewish Temple, and the Service thereof. Where, as may be seen, *Luke i. 10.* All the People went to their private Prayers, and Devotions in the Court of the Temple, while the Priest continued at the golden Altar in the Temple to offer up Incense. In this Vision therefore is a *Metalepsis*, or Comprehension of two Allusions, or Figures: For *first* by Heaven is meant the Catholick Church of that propheticall Period; by the Angels are signified the Christian High-priests; and by Incense their offering up the Peoples Prayers in all Churches of the Saints, and all again under another figurative Representation of the Jewish Temple, Priesthood, and Worship. So in the vii<sup>th</sup> Chapter, where under the Type of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, is mystically represented the Church of Christ, after the sealing of the Faithful out of every Tribe, or Church, it is said: *After this I beheld, and lo a great Multitude, which no Man could number of all Nations — stood before the Throne, and the Lamb, and they cried with a loud Voice, saying, Salvation unto our God, who sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb, and all the Angels stood about the Throne, and about the Elders, and the four Living Creatures, and fell before the Throne with their Faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen. Blessing, and Glory, and Wisdom, and Thanksgiving, and Honour, and Power, and Might be unto God for ever and ever. Amen.* Here again, as we have the faithful Christians of all Churches praising God: So under the Representation of Angels we have all their Bishops with their Presbyters at their Priestly Work, of blessing, and praising God. At their Priestly Work I say, and exercising their Priestly Office through-  
out



out all the *Mystical Israel*, signified by the four living Creatures, which were the four Symbols, or Ensigns of the four Camps of *Israel*. I say at their Priestly Office. For the Ministers of the Church may be considered as to their *Priesthood*, or as to their *Prelacy*, or spiritual Superiority over the People. As *Prelates*, or spiritual Superiors over the People, they are called Bishops, and Presbyters, of the reason of which Titles, you know, Sir, we have a very good Account in <sup>a</sup> Mr. Hill's Book, cited in the

<sup>a</sup> L'ancienne police de l'Eglise sur l'administration de l'Eucharistie, par M. Gabriel de l'Aubespine, Evêque d'Orleans, Ch. VIII. Premièrement il y a deux qualités dans l'Episcopat, la Prelature, & le Sacerdoce. La première est le pouvoir, l'autorité, & la juridiction Ecclésiastique — l'autre est le pouvoir du Caractère, & de l'ordination. Les anciens ont connus ces deux puissances, &c. So a Learned Divine of our own Country Mr. Sam. Hill, in the third Chapter of his Book de Presbyteratu.

<sup>a</sup> De Presbyteratu Differt. Lib. IV. Cap. III. Quandoquidem Sapientiam, & Senioritatem animi internam ad publicam Senioritatis Didacticæ ordinem, & officiam præviam probavimus, ejusdemque Senioritatis virtutes, & officia ad veram, & intrinsecam Sacerdotii dignitatem necessario prærequirantur; exinde patet Sacerdotium aliquod amplius Senioritati additum apertissime complecti. Commune igitur sit Seniori, & Sacerdoti, ut religionis Deo præagere, sanctæque sapientia traditionem ex officio divinitus concessa, & sacro, uterque propaget. Quod vero Sacerdotii proprium est, & mero Senioris ordini extrinsecum, & superius, hic loci opportunè discutiendum videntur. Omne ergo Sacerdotium publicum, quantum rimari liceat, ab ipsis mundi primordiis duplicia exequitur pietatis officia, Moralia scilicet, & Mystica, sive Symbolica, vel Sacramentalia. Mystica autem Sacerdotii Levitici in his tribus potissimum constiterant, in Lotionibus, Sacrificiis, & dapibus eorumque propriis Ceremoniis. Moralia autem in sacris benedictionibus, Deut. xxi. 3. Liturgiis precum, & laudis, & personarum, & rerum piis usibus devotarum consecrationibus celebrandis, versabantur. Notari igitur velim, & in veteri, & in nostro Sacerdotio eadem omnino esse moralia, mystica vero diversa, nostra vero prioribus ἀντίστοιχα. Siquidem Lotionibus Leviticis nostrum lavacrum, istorum Sacrificiis Christi víctima, veterum dapibus Cæna Domini ex adverso respondent: Ex quibus unicum, i. e. Christi Sacrificium ab ipso solo Christo pontifice offerri potuit, semelque ideo offerrebat. Lavacrum, & sanctam Cænam selectis ad hæc Sa-

## 260 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

the Margin, and in Dr. *Hammond's* Note *b* on *Acts* xi. and as Bishops, and Presbyters, they have Authority to govern, and teach the People the Revelations, and Institutions of God; and because their Doctrine is to the Peoples Souls, as Food is to their Bodies; they are said to be their Pastors, who feed, as well as govern their Flocks. Also as Bishops, and Presbyters, that is, as chief, and subordinate Rulers appointed by God, they receive their penitential Acknowledgments, and Confessions, and absolve, or refuse to absolve them of their Offences, in his Name; and in this Relation they stand before the People for God. But as *Priests*, they stand before God for the People, to pray for them, that is, to bless them, and to offer up their Prayers, and Praises, and Sacrifices; and to perform the mystical Rites, and Offices of our Religion in the *Holy Supper*, and *Baptism*, which answer to the mystical *Lavations*, *Sacrifices*, and *federal sacrificial Feasts* both

---

*cerdotii Christiani munera discipulis Christus consecranda tradidit.* To which let me add out of *Isidore's* Original, *Lib. VII. Cap. XI.* *Episcopus autem vocabulum inde dictum, quod ille qui superest, efficitur, superintendat, Curam scilicet gerens subditorum.* *Επορεύειν enim Grace intendere dicitur.* *Episcopi autem Grace, Latine Speculatores interpretantur.* — *Pontifex Princeps Sacerdotum est, quasi via sequentium.* *Ipse & summus Sacerdos, ipse & Pontifex maximus nuncupatur.* *Ipse enim efficit Sacerdotes, atque Levitas.* *Ipse omnes ordines Ecclesiasticos disponit.* *Ipse quod unusquisque facere debet, ostendit.* — *Antistes Sacerdos dictus ab eo, quod antestat.* *Primus est enim in ordine Ecclesie & supra se nullum habet.* *Sacerdos autem — quasi sacrum dans.* *Sicut enim Rex à regendo, ita Sacerdos à sacrificando vocatus est.* *Consecrat enim, & sanctificat.* *Presbyter Grace Latineque Senior interpretatur; non pro ætate — sed propter honorem, & dignitatem, quam acceperunt, Presbyteri nuncupantur.* — *Ideo autem & Presbyteri Sacerdotes vocantur, quia sacra dant, sicut & Episcopi: qui licet sint Sacerdotes, tamen pontificatus apicem non habent, quia nec Chrismate frontem signant, nec paracletum Spiritum dant.* *Quod solum debere Episcopis tertium Añum Apostolorum demonstrat.* *Levitæ — Grace Diaconi, Latine Ministri dicuntur, quia sicut in Sacerdote Consecratio: ita in Diacono ministerii dispensatio habetur.*

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 261

of the *Jewish*, and *Gentile* World, whereof the latter, as any Man may plainly see from the most ancient Heathen Authors, was a Depravation, and Corruption of the former. As *Priests* also they consecrate *Places* to the Service, and *Persons* to the Ministry of God, by solemn Separation of the one from common Use, and of the other from common Employments, to divine Uses, and Employments.

But to return from this short Excursion to the holy Apocalyptical *Angels*, the seven Bishops of the seven *Asian* Churches are called the seven Angels, Ch. i. 20. *The Mystery of the seven Stars, which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven Golden Candlesticks. The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches, and the seven golden Candlesticks, which thou sawest, are the seven Churches.* And as they are called so in general, so every one of them in particular is mystically so called in the second Chapter of this prophetical Book. As for instance, to the *Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, that is, to the Chief Priest, or Bishop of the Church of Ephesus, write these things. I say to the Chief Priest, or Bishop, for as these mystical *Angels*, are sometimes described as *Priests* by this Evangelical Prophet, so under the Name of *Presbyters*, i. e. of *ruling*, or *presiding* Presbyters, they are described as spiritual Chiefs, or Princes, Cap. iv. 4. according to what, Sir, you know I have written of them in my Second Letter to Mr. S. G. The Text with the Context is as follows, *Immediately I was in the Spirit, and behold a Throne was set in Heaven, and one sat on the Throne — And round about the Throne were four, and twenty Seats, (or other Thrones) and upon the Seats I saw four and twenty Presbyters sitting, clothed in white Raiment, and they had on their Heads*

---

<sup>inf</sup> Πρεσβύτεροι προσεβύτησαν, 1 Tim. v. 17. Ἱερεῖς, Hebr. xiii. 7. 17. Πρεσβύτεροι, Rom. xii. 8.

## 262 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*Crowns of Gold.*—And they fell down before him, who sat on the Throne, and worshipped him, who liveth for ever, and ever, and cast their Crowns before the Throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, &c. Here, Sir, I must observe that as to the golden Crowns, this propheticall Description answers to the golden Crown, which was made for *Jophua* the High Priest, *Zach. vi. 11.* and that by Golden Crowns here are signified Golden Miters, such as the High Priests had under the Law, whose Miters were also called Crowns. This shews, Sir, that by Presbyters cannot be understood the inferiour Presbyters, but the chief ruling Presbyters, the Bishops, who are here represented as Chief, or Princes, in the spiritual Dominions of Christ upon Earth. They are also said to be twenty four, in allusion to the Chiefs of the twenty four Lots of the Priests, *1 Chron. xxiv.* And, in Allusion to the Presbyters sitting about the Throne of the Bishop, they are represented to sit round the Throne

---

See Dr. *Hammond* on the Place.

Viginti quatuor Seniores qui ad declarandam omnipotentis Dei gloriam in circuitu throni ejus confidere dicuntur, Ecclesia Rectores & Episcopos designant: atque hi, quia tam Sacerdotes sunt quam Reges juxta illud, c. i. 3. Fecit nos Reges, & Sacerdotes, idcirco candidis vestimentis induti, & coronas aureas ferentes cernuntur; per quæ mysticè illorum decet & gloria expressa intelliguntur. Ideo autem xxiv. Seniores, vel potius Presbyteri (nam dignitatem hic πρεσβυτέρους declarare arbitror potius quam ætatem) cernuntur, ut respondeant xxiv. sortibus Sacerdotum, quas David ex duabus familiis Eleazar, & Ithamar filiorum Aaron constituit *1. Par. 24.* ut quemadmodum sub illis xxiv. sortibus, in xvi. ex filiis Eleazar, & viii. ex filiis Ithamar, universa Sacerdotum ac Levitarum turba continebatur, ita in his xxiv. Presbyteris omnes totius Ecclesiæ Præsides designentur. Zeger. Rev. iv. 4.

Πρεσβυτέρους τὸ ἐπισκοπῆς εἰς τόπον θεῶν καὶ τὸ πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον Συναγωγῆς τὸ Αποστόλων. Ignat. ad Magnes. So in Epist. ad Trall. Ἐπιστολὴν δὲ — τὸ ἐπισκοπῶν ὡς ὄντα τόπον τὸ πάλαιος as Cor. or as Vossius corrects the Place, ὡς τὸ πάλαιος καὶ τὸ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς Συναγωγῶν θεῶν. See H. Hammond's dissert. secundam contra sententiam Blondelli. cap. xxiv. 7, 8.



## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 263

of God, and they are said to be clothed in white Garments, to set forth their Sanctity, and great Dignity, as Christ's Chief Ministers in the Church. Here then let me observe, the Bishops are described by their Regal Character, as Christ's Vicegerents, to govern his Church in their respective Districts. But in the first Chapter, v. 6. they are represented in their double Capacities, both as Kings, and Priests, in these Words, *Unto him who loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings, and Priests unto God, to him be Glory, and Dominion for ever, and ever. Amen.* This place, as that in 1 Pet. ii. 9. relates to Exod. xix. 6. where God promised the Jews, that if they would obey his Voice, and keep his Covenant, they should be unto him a Kingdom of Priests, and an holy Nation, and a peculiar Treasure above all other People. This promise of God, which was made to the whole collective Body of the Jews, is to be understood of that Theocratical Form of Government under the \* High Priest, and Priests, in which as a Nation, or People, they were to be thoroughly settled, and this honourable Promise was made but a very short time before it was performed. Hence the Greek Interpreters aptly translate a Kingdom of Priests, a Regal Priesthood, because Aaron, and his Successors were the chief Magistrates of that People, as well as their High Priests. St. Peter useth the same Expression, 1 Epist. ii. 9. where after he had told the Christian Jews, that as a Christian People they *as lively Stones were built up into a*

---

\* So Vatablus thinks it is in the primary sense to be understood, *Regnum Sacerdotale*, — *Ad verb. Regnum Sacerdotum, h. e. regnum non profanum, quod ex opibus & armis, sed quod ex Sacerdotibus, rebus sacris ac divinis constat, q. d. Sacrum ac Divinum erit hoc regnum.*

† See the Allegory of building the Tower of the Church in *Hermas's Pastor*, Visio iii. Lib. i.

## 264 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*spiritual House*, or Oeconomy of an *holy Priesthood* upon Christ, as the chief corner Stone, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices to God by him; then farther, to explain the Form of this spiritual Oeconomy, he proceeds to tell them, that they were still, as in the time of their *Theocracy*, a chosen Generation, an holy Nation, a peculiar People formed into the Government of a Regal Priesthood, or Kingdom of Priests, under Jesus the High Priest of our Profession, and his Ministers, to make them again the People of God. So in this place the Apostolical Prophet gives Glory, and Dominion to Christ, for purchasing a Church with his Blood, and making the Oeconomy of it a <sup>2</sup> *Kingdom of Priests*. St. Paul means the same thing in his second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. vi. v. 16. *What Agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, for ye are the Temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, or among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my People.* Here, as in all places, where the Church is called an House, there is a *Metalepsis* of Tropes; for first the Temple signifies an holy House dedicated to God, and secondly, that holy House signifies the Family, or Oeconomy of that holy House, which is <sup>3</sup> built on Christ as its Foundation, and in which the Priests as Superiors are to govern, teach, and minister in holy Offices, and the People, as Inferiors are to be governed, and taught, and perform holy Offices by the Priests, and which therefore make a holy Theocracy unto God. So 1 *Cor.* iii. after the Apostle had told them, that there was no Foundation of the Church but Christ, and that he had laid no other Foundation; *Know ye not* (saith he) *that you, as a Building erected upon Christ, are*

---

<sup>2</sup> See Zeger, a little above cited in the Margin.

<sup>3</sup> 1 *Cor.* iii. v. 11, 12. *Ephes.* ii. 20. *Sacerdotes Templi Spiritualis, id est Ecclesia.* Tertull. *adversus Judæos*, C. 14.

## The Christian Priesthood Asserted. 265

the Temples of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you, as in his Sanctuary : If any Man therefore by bad Materials dare defile, or destroy the Temple of God, him shall God destroy, for the Temple of God is holy, which Temple ye are. The Oeconomy therefore of the Church in general, and of every particular Church is a Temple, or spiritual Oeconomy, where the Priests have the whole Administration, and the High Priest, <sup>b</sup> as Christ's Vicegerent, is Chief Rector, as well as Chief Priest. Such similitudes as these do the Writers of the New Testament use to make Christians, as Christians understand, that the Church is a holy spiritual Kingdom, a Theocracy in the most proper Sense, in which the Priests are the Sanhedrim, or Senate, and the High Priests, as Princes, or Presidents thereof. And for this St. John gives Glory to Christ, who hath made us Kings, or as <sup>c</sup> many Copies have it, who hath made us a Kingdom, and Priests unto God. So *Arethas* upon the place also reads it ; so the vulgar *Latin*, *Syriac*, *Arabick*, and *Aethiopic* Versions translate it ; as also, *Tertull. Exhort. ad Castit. c. 7.* To be a Kingdom of Priests, or a Royal Priesthood, or a Kingdom, and Priests, or Kings, and Priests, are but different Expressions for the same

---

<sup>b</sup> Cyprian. Oxford Edition Epist. lxxvi. Cum te Judicem Dei constituas, ac Christi, qui dicit ad Apostolos, & per hos ad omnes prepositos, qui Apostolis vicariâ ordinatione succedunt, qui vos audit me audit. So Epist. lix. Neque enim aliunde Hæreses oborta sunt, aut nata Schismata, quam inde quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos, ac Judex vice Christi cogitatur. Ibid. Firmilian. Epist. lxxv. Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, & Ecclesiis, quæ illi a Christo missi constituerunt, & Episcopis, qui eis ordinatione vicariâ successerunt. See *Tertullian de præscript. Cap. xxxii.* St. *Clement's Epist. ad Corinthos xlii.* *Ignatius's Epistles. 1 Cor. iv. 1.* And *Erasmus*, in his *Latin Prayer for the Peace of the Church* : Da pastoribus, quibus vices tuas delegare dignatus es, Prophetiæ donum, ut arcanas Scripturas non ex humano sensu, sed ex tuo afflatu interpretentur.

<sup>c</sup> *Βασίλειον* Steph. a. 16. Alex. Baroc. Cov. 2. Sin. M. Hunt. 1, Dr. *Milles on the Place.*

## 266 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

thing, for the second is the *Greek Translation*, and the third the *Chaldee Version* of *Mamlechoth Cohenim*; a Kingdom of Priests in *Exod. xix. 6.* which <sup>d</sup> *Miles Coverdale* in his *English Bible* (supposed to be printed at *Zurich*) 1550, renders a *Priesterly Kingdom*. And if it is the true reading of this place, *St. John* makes use of it, as *St. Peter* doth of a *Royal Priesthood*, to let us understand what reason we have to glorifie Christ, who hath made us Members of this holy Theocracy, which in every part of it is governed under him by sacerdotal Princes, or Priests. This Expression of *making us Kings and Priests unto God*, is also used by this Christian Prophet, in the tenth Verse of the fifth Chapter, *Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood, out of every Kindred, Tongue, People, and Nation, and hast made us unto our God Kings, and Priests, and we shall reign on Earth.* - He also speaks much after the same manner in the sixth Verse of the twentieth Chapter, where it is said, that those who have part in the first Resurrection shall be Priests of God, and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand Years. And in the xxii<sup>d</sup> Chap. v. 5. that in the holy City the New *Jerusalem*, the Servants of God shall reign for ever, and ever. But because these places relate to a future, and far more glorious, and different State of the Church, I pass them over, only desiring Liberty to tell my own Opinion, that if they are not to be understood of Christians severally, as *Tertullian* takes them in a metaphorical Sense to denote Christian Purity; but as in *1 Pet. xi. 9.* of the whole collected body of *Jewish Christians* as a Spiritual Building, an holy Nation, a peculiar Poli-

---

<sup>a</sup> If ye will hearken now unto my Voice, and keep my Covenant, ye shall be mine own before all People; for the whole Earth is mine, and ye shall be unto me a *Priesterly Kingdom*, and an holy People. In *1 Pet. ii. 9.* thus, But ye are that chosen Generation, that Kingly Priesthood, that holy Nation, that peculiar People.



## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 267

ty, People incorporated into the Church; then also they must relate to the Christian Theocracy, and the administration of it in a Royal Priesthood under Christ, though in a much more happy, triumphant, and glorious State, than this.

But, *Sir*, whatever the Sense of these Passages, or that in the first Chapter be, Whether they are spoken of Christians *severally*, or *collectively*, of single Christians, or of Christians formed into a Society, or \* Polity of a Royal Priesthood, I have sufficiently shewed from other places of the *Revelation*, that tho' *St. John* doth not *expressly* call the Bishops of the Church Priests, yet he calls them so by other Mystical Names, and sets forth their Ministry, as a proper Priesthood, which offered up the mystical Incense the Prayers of all Saints, that is of the Church, more especially in the Service of the Holy Eucharist, when according to the Prophecy of *Malachy*, the most solemn Prayers, and Praises were offered unto God by a holy Priesthood on the Mystical Golden Altar, in every Christian Church: Christians then are a Kingdom of Priests, as well as the *Jews* were; a Congregation, or Multitude of People formed like them into a Priestly Government, and by the Ministrations of Priests to serve, and worship God, and by their hands to offer their external Sacrifices of Bread, and Wine,

---

\* *Ecclesia plebs est Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo grex adherens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in Episcopo; & si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in Ecclesia non esse; & frustra sibi blandiri eos, qui pacem cum Sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt, & latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt; quando Ecclesia quæ catholica una est, scissa non sit, neque divisa; sed sit utique connexa, & coherentium sibi invicem Sacerdotum glutino copulata.* Cyprian Epist. LXVI. See also the excellent Annotations on Tertull. Lib. de exhortatione Castitatis, Cap. VII. 39, 40. Edit. Tertull. Vol. II. Parisiis MDCXXXV.

and

## 268 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

and by their Mouths to offer up <sup>f</sup> Eucharistical Prayers, and Praises, and Intercessions to him, which God thro' Christ our High Priest will accept, as he did the Sacrifices, and Prayers of the *Jews*. This is very agreeable Doctrine to what I have shew'd was taught in the early, and pure Ages of the Church. Ἀρχιεργλικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ἱερὸν τῷ Θεῷ, &c. (saith *Justin* in his <sup>g</sup> Dialogue with the Jew) *We are the true Sacerdotal People of God, as God himself testifies, saying, <sup>h</sup> That in every place among the Gentiles pure and acceptable Sacrifices should be brought unto him. But God accepts Sacrifices from none, but by his Priests. God therefore testifies before the time, that all Sacrifices should be acceptable to him in this Name [of Jesus] Which Jesus appointed to be done, I mean in the Eucharist of the Bread, and the Cup, and which are offered up by Christians in all places of the Earth; but your Sacrifices offered up by your Priests, he utterly rejects, <sup>i</sup> saying, I will not receive your Sacrifices from your hands. Because from the rising of the Sun unto the setting thereof, my Name shall be glorified among the Gentiles, but you have profaned it. He speaks to the same Purpose, citing the Prophet Malachy, more perfectly, as I have transcribed the Passage before. Thus much Sir, as to the Prophetical Book of the New Testament; in which, I hope, I have shew'd, that setting aside the Texts, in which we are said to be Kings, and Priests, St. John hath called Christian Bishops, Priests, in the same figurative way of Writing, that he calls Christians Jews. To which I have but*

---

<sup>f</sup> Ὁυῖοι δὲ καὶ αἰώνιοι βασιλεῖς, ὁ Χριστός, ὡς ὁ Θεός. ἔν τῃ πάλιν παρουσία μὴ δόξης λείπον ἡσάτων ἢ πού ἄλλας προσφύτας δυσίας ἀπ' αἱμάτων ἢ ποινῶν ἐπὶ τὸ δυσιασθεῖον ἀναφέρει, ἀλλὰ ἀληθινὸς καὶ πνευματικὸς αἴνους, καὶ ἐυχαιρίας.

<sup>g</sup> Pag. 344.

<sup>h</sup> Malac. i. 10, 11, 12.

<sup>i</sup> Malach. i. 11.

## *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.* 269

one Observation more to add, which relates to his Description of the four, and twenty Elders, who had Crowns or Mitres of Gold on their Heads, and the Tradition of his wearing the Golden Crown, or Miter; in the Front of which there was engraven, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. *Sir*, you cannot but remark that this Story, which is so well attested, and his Description of the Christian Priests agree very well together. But it is time to put an end to my Letter, and the Exercise of your Patience in reading of it; which I shall here do with an hearty Prayer, that all Christian Presbyters, and Bishops, would as it becomes them, assert the *Truth* of their Priestly Character with all Boldness, and adorn it with all Sanctity of Life, and Manners, to the Honour of him, who is our \* King, Prophet, and High-priest, the Angel, and Apostle of God, from whom we derive our Priestly Powers, and Authority; and to whom with the Father, and the Holy Ghost be all Honour, and Glory in all the Churches of the Saints now, and for ever. *Amen.* With this Prayer, and part of that with which St. *Ambrose* ended his Book of the *Sacerdotal Dignity*, I conclude this Discourse of the *Christian Priesthood*:

*Quamquam sciam pra hoc libello plurimos mihi Sacerdotes, qui quæ loquimur agere nolunt, infideliter esse detracturos, Credo tamen plurimos, qui hæc agunt, vel agere obnituntur, fideliter pro nobis Oraturos. Sed sicut lacerationibus obtrecta-*

---

\* Just. in Apol. dist. 11. p. 95. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 312.

270 *The Christian Priesthood Asserted.*

*torum minime pręgravamur, sic demum probatorum, & sanctorum virorum orationibus adjuvamus. Age jam nunc sanctificus spiritus, qui nos in hoc opere divinis inspirationibus adjuvisti, cunctos Sacerdotes adjuva, & pręsta, ut faciant quę in hoc opusculo ipse eloqui inspirasti, Amen.*



---

FINIS.



## Books Printed for RICHARD SARE.

I. **T**HE Genuine Epistles of St. Barnabas, St. Ignatius, St. Clement, St. Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas, with a large preliminary Discourse, the 2<sup>d</sup> Edition corrected, 8°. price 6 s.

II. A practical Discourse concerning Swearing, especially in the two great Points of Perjury and common Swearing, 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

III. The Principles of the Christian Religion, explain'd in a brief Commentary on the Church-Catechism, 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

IV. The Church of Rome no Guide in Matters of Faith, in answer to a Letter from a Nephew to his Uncle, containing his Reasons why he became a Roman Catholick, and why he now declines any farther Disputes about Matters of Religion, 8°. price 6 d.

V. The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods, asserted, with particular respect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England, occasioned by a late Pamphlet, entituled, *A Letter to a Convocation-man*, 8°. price 5 s.

VI. An Appeal to all true Members of the Church of England, in behalf of the King's Supremacy as by Law established, by our Convocations approved, and by our most eminent Bishops and Clergy-men stated and defended, against both Popish and Fanatical Opposers of it, 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

VII. The State of the Church and Clergy of the Church of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, and other publick Assemblies, Historically deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons to the present Times; with a large Appendix of original Writs, and other Instruments, Folio, price 18 s.

VIII. The Bishop of Lincoln's two Charges to the Clergy of his Diocese, in his Primary and Triennial Visitation, price of each 1 s.

*These by the Right Reverend Dr. Wake, Lord Bishop of Lincoln.*

I. **E**PICTETUS's Morals, with SIMPLICIUS's Comment, done into English. The Third Edition: With the Addition of the Life of Epictetus, 8°. price 5 s.

II. *Parsons* his Christian Directory; being a Treatise of holy Resolution, in Two Parts: purged from all Errors, and put into Modern English. And now made publick for the Instruction of the Ignorant, conviction of Unbelievers, awakening and reclaiming the Vicious, and for confirming religious Persons in their good Purposes, 8°. price 5 s.

III. The Christian Pattern, or a Treatise of the Imitation of Jesus Christ; in Four Books. Written originally in Latin by Thomas à Kempis. To which are added Meditations and Prayers for sick Persons, in 8°. with Cuts, price 5 s. And also in 12°. price 2 s.

IV. The Truth and Excellence of the Christian Religion asserted, against Jews, Infidels, and Hereticks; in 16 Sermons, preach'd at the Cathedral Church of S. Paul, in the Years 1701, 1702. being the Lectures founded by the Hon. R. Boyle, 4°. price bound 9 s.

V. A Paraphrase and Comment upon the Epistles and Gospels, appointed to be used by the Church of England, on all Sundays

and

and *Holydays* throughout the Year, Designed to excite Devotion, and promote the Knowledge and Practice of sincere Piety and Virtue; in Four Volumes.

VI. Also several Sermons upon special Occasions.

*These by the Reverend Dr. Stanhope, Dean of Canterbury.*

**A** Second Collection of Controversial Letters relating to the Church of England, and the Church of Rome, as they passed between an honourable Lady, and Dr. George Hickes. To which is added, A Letter written by a Gentlewoman of Quality to a Romish Priest upon her Return from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. And an Answer to some Queries sent by a Roman Catholick to a Divine of the Church of England. With an Appendix to the Controversial Letters. 8<sup>o</sup>.

**T**HE Works of *Flavius Josephus*, translated into English. Folio and in 8<sup>o</sup>.

II. Fables of *Æsop*, and other eminent *Mythologists*, with Morals and Reflections. Folio and 8<sup>o</sup>.

III. Fables and Stories moralized; being a Second Part of the Fables of *Æsop*, and other eminent *Mythologists*. Folio and 8<sup>o</sup>.

IV. Twenty two select Colloquies out of *Erasmus Roterodamus*; pleasantly representing several superstitious Levities that were crept into the Church of Rome in his Days, 8<sup>o</sup>. price 2 s. 6 d.

V. *Quevedo's* Visions; the Tenth Edition, 8<sup>o</sup>.

*These by Sir Roger L'Estrange.*

**I.** A Short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage; with the sense of Antiquity upon this Argument: 8<sup>o</sup>. price 3 s. 6 d.

II. A Defence of the short View of the Profaneness and Immorality of the English Stage, &c. being a Reply to Mr. Congreve's Amendments, &c. 8<sup>o</sup>. price 18 d.

III. A second Defence of the short View, &c. in Answer to a Book, entituled, *The Antient and Modern Stages Vindicated*, 8<sup>o</sup>. price 1 s. 6 d.

IV. The Emperor *M. Antoninus* his Conversation with himself; together with the preliminary Discourse of the Learned *Gataker*. As also the Emperor's Life, written by *M. D'Acier*, and supported by the Authorities collected by Dr. Stanhope. To which is added the Mythological Picture of *Cebes the Theban*. Translated into English from their respective Originals, 8<sup>o</sup>. price 5 s.

V. Essays upon several Moral Subjects; in Two Parts. The Fifth Edition, 8<sup>o</sup>. price 5 s.

VI. A Dissuasive from the Play-house, price 3 d.

*These by Mr. Collier.*

**T**He Essay towards a Proposal for Catholick Communion, &c. lately published by a (pretended) Minister of the Church of England; printed at large, and answered Chapter by Chapter. By *N. Spinkes*, a Presbyter of the Church of England, 8<sup>o</sup>. price 4 s.

**A**N Answer to all the Excuses and Pretences that Men ordinarily make for their not coming to the Holy Communion. To which is added, a brief Account of the End and Design of the

Holy Communion; the obligation to receive it; the way to prepare for it. And the behaviour of our selves, both at, and after it, &c. price 3 d. or 20 s. per 100.

II. Plain Instructions for the Young and Ignorant; compriz'd in a short and easie Exposition of the Church-Catechism. Adapted to the Understanding and Memory of the meanest Capacity. price 3 d. or 20 s. per 100.

III. An Essay towards making the Knowledge of Religion easie to the meanest Capacity; being a short and plain Account of the Doctrines and Rules of Christianity. Price 2 d. or 12 s. per 100.

IV. Some short and plain Directions for Spending one day well, by which, (if every day carefully observed) a Man may be much enabled (through God's Grace) to spend his whole Life well. price 1 d. or 6 s. per 100.

V. A Gentleman's Religion, in Three Parts: The first contains the Principles of Natural Religion; The second and third, the Doctrines of Christianity, both as to Faith and Practice. With an Appendix, wherein it is proved, that nothing contrary to our Reason can possibly be the Object of our Belief; but that it is no just Exception to some of the Doctrines of Christianity, that they are above our Reason, 12°. price 2 s. 6 d.

*These by the same Author.*

THE Corruptions of the Church of Rome, in relation to Ecclesiastical Government, the Rule of Faith, and Form of Divine Worship, in Answer to the Bishop of Meaux's Queries. By the Right Reverend Dr. Bull, Lord Bishop of St. David's. Price 6 d. stitch'd, or 8 d. bound.

THE Reasonableness and Certainty of the Christian Religion, in Two Parts; by Robert Jenkins, late Fellow of St. John's College in Cambridge; The Third Edition very much enlarged, price 11 s.

THE Canon of the New Testament vindicated, in answer to the Objections of J. Toland. By John Richardson, B. D. formerly Fellow of Emanuel-College, Cambridge. The second Edition, 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

I. OF the Law of Nature and Nations, in eight Books. Written originally in Latin by Baron Pufendorf, Counsellor of State to the late King of Sweden. Translated into English, the 2<sup>d</sup> Edit. fol.

II. Thoughts on Religion, and other Subjects. By Monsieur Paschal. Translated out of French, 8°. price 5 s.

III. The Christian Casuist, or a Treatise resolving several Cases of Conscience. Written by Mr. Placet, and translated into English, 8°. price 5 s.

IV. Pastoral Instructions and Meditations for an Annual Retirement of Ten Days, recommended to the Clergy of his Diocese. By Anthony Godeau, Bishop of Grasse and Vence. 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

*These by Mr. Basil Kennet.*

A Treatise of Laws in general, of their Nature and Design, and of the Interpretation of them. Translated out of French. Being

ing a proper Introduction to the *New Institute* of the Imperial or Civil Law, with Notes, &c. lately publish'd, 8°. price 2 s.

A new *Institute* of the Imperial or Civil Law, with Notes; shewing in some particular Cases, amongst other Observations, how the Canon Law, and the Laws of *England*, and the Laws and Customs of other Nations, differ from it.

The Christian Scholar in Rules and Directions for Children and Youth sent to *English* Schools, more especially design'd for the poor Boys taught and clothed in the Parish of *St. Botolph Aldgate*. The Fifth Edition. price 3 d. or 20 s. per 100.

The Devout Christian's Manual of Prayers and Devotions for all Occasions, containing special Litanies for *Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays*; as also particular Offices for the Holy Communion, and in the time of Sickness, supervised and recommended by the Reverend *Mr. Wagstaff*, 12°. price 1 s. 6 d.

The Nature and Design of *Holy-days* explain'd, or some short and plain Reasons and Instructions for the observation of the Feasts and Fasts of the Church of *England*. price 6 d. or 40 s. per 100.

Memoirs of *Henry Guthry*, late Bishop of *Dunkel* in *Scotland*, wherein the Conspiracy and Rebellion against King *Charles I.* of Blessed Memory, till the time of the Murther of that Monarch, are briefly and faithfully related, 8°. price 3 s. 6 d.

The great Sin and Folly of Drunkenness; with a particular Address to the Female Sex. price 6 d. stitch'd, or 8 d. bound.

*Caroli Daubus Presbyteri &c. A. M. pro Testimonio Flavii Josephi de Jesu Christo, Libri Duo, &c. Cum Prefatione Johannis Ernesti Grabe.* 8°. price 3 s. 6 d.

I. THE Christian's Overthrow prevented, and Conquest gain'd. A Sermon preach'd before the Queen in *St. James's Chapel*, on Sunday April 22. 1705.

II. A Sermon preach'd before the L. Mayor, C. of Aldermen, and the Governours of the several Hospitals of the City of *London*, in *Easter-week*, 1706. being one of the Anniversary *Spittal* Sermons.

III. A Sermon preach'd before the Honourable House of Commons, in *St. Margaret's Westminster*, on the 30th of *Jan.* 1706—7.

These three by the Reverend *Dr. Robert Mof.*

MAXIMS and Reflections upon Plays. Written in *French* by the Bishop of *Meaux*. With an Advertisement concerning the Book and Translation: By *Mr. Collier*, 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

Moral Maxims and Reflections; in Four Parts. Written in *French* by the Duke of *Rochefoucault*: Now made *English*. The Second Edition revised and corrected; with the Addition of 135 Maxims, not translated before, 12°. price 1 s. 6 d.

The *Turkish Spy*, consisting of Eight Volumes, in 12°.

Humane Prudence, or the Art by which a Man may raise Himself and Fortune to Grandeur. The Tenth Edition, 12°. price 1 s. 6 d.

*L. Moyn's* Art of Writing, and judging of History. Translated out of *French*, 12°. price 1 s. 6 d.